PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

APR 6 1936

The American Historical Review

Vol. XLI No. 3 April, 1936

ISSUED QUARTERLY

CONTENTS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION — The Association at Chattanooga — 439

RICHARD H. SHRYOCK — Medical Science and the Social Historian — 458

DUDLEY S. LONG — The Austro-French Commercial Treaty of 1866 — 474

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS—Richard W. Van Alstyne, John E. Crampton, Gunpowder or Dust? — 492

DOCUMENTS—An Analytic Digest to Aranjuez, 1779, contributed by Clarence W. Bowman — 503

REVIEWS OF BOOKS—Becker and Duvall, *The History of Western Civilization*; Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, III–IV; Willard, *Parliamentary Taxes, 1290–1334*; Chambers, *Thomas More*; Hazeltine, *Mercenaries*; Duncan, *Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade*, IV; Fuller, *Washington's Farewell Address*; Mowry, *James G. Blaine*; *War Memoirs of Robert Lansing* — 515

(For a complete list of reviews, see inside cover pages)

HISTORICAL NEWS — 592

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

[illegible] publishing, Lancaster, Pa.

[illegible] Avenue, New York

Entered as [illegible] Act of [illegible]

BOARD OF EDITORS

ARTHUR E. R. BOAK — J. FRED RIPPY
DUMAS MALONE — CHARLES SEYMOUR
NELLIE NEILSON — PRESERVED SMITH

AND

HENRY E. BOURNE
Managing Editor

Editorial Assistant
ELEANOR D. SMITH

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Books of General, Ancient, and Medieval History

PAGE

Barnes and David, *History of Western Civilisation*, by Lynn Thorndike 515
Griffith, *Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World*, by Jakob A. O. Larsen 519
Page, *History of the County of Rutland*, II, by Elisabeth G. Kimball 520
Edler, *Mediaeval Italian Business Terms*, by Dino Bigongiari 521
Thorndike, *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, III–IV, by T. Wingate Todd 523
Willard, *Parliamentary Taxes, 1290–1334*, by H. L. Gray 525

Books of Modern History

Imbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la Réforme*, IV, by Preserved Smith 527
Chambers, *Thomas More*, by Conyers Read 528
Wright, *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England*, by E. P. Cheyney 530
Morgan, *Bibliography of British History, 1700–1715*, I, by Violet Barbour 532
Heckscher, *Mercantilism*, by Clive Day 534
Volz, *Correspondenz Friedrich's des Grossen*, XLIV, by Walter L. Dorn 536
Cobban, *Rousseau and the Modern State*, by Crane Brinton 538
Taylor, *Italian Problem in European Diplomacy*, by Kent Roberts Greenfield 539
Rosenberg, *Publizistik Deutschlands*, by Lawrence D. Steefel 540
Documents diplomatiques français, sér. I, tome VI, by E. Malcolm Carroll 542
Documents diplomatiques français, sér. II, tome VI; sér. III, tome VIII, by Sidney B. Fay 544

Books of American History

Means, *The Spanish Main*, by Osgood Hardy 546
Donnan, *Documents of the Slave Trade to America*, IV, by Leonard W. Labaree 547

(List of Reviews of Books continued inside back cover page)

The American Historical Association supplies the REVIEW *to all its members; the Council of the Association elects members of the Board of Editors.*

Subscriptions should be sent to The Macmillan Company, 6–8 North Sixth Street, Richmond, Va., or 60 Fifth Avenue, New York. The price of subscription is $5.00 a year; single numbers are sold for $1.50 (back numbers at the same rate); bound volumes may be obtained for $7.50.

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the REVIEW *may be sent to the Managing Editor, Henry E. Bourne, 40 Independence Ave., S. W., Washington, D. C. Books for review should be sent to the same address.*

COPYRIGHT, 1936, BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Volume XLI] *April, 1936* [*Number 3*

The

American Historical Review

THE ASSOCIATION AT CHATTANOOGA

MISSIONARY Ridge and the TVA. Tragic memories and a prophecy, perhaps a portent. On the one hand, monuments of a struggle in which an old and interesting social order moved one stage nearer to its doom; on the other, gigantic constructions in process which promise light, heat, and power to the common man, the first spectacular example of a planned society, with energies directed by a supreme centralized state. What a setting for a meeting of any one of the three great associations devoted to the social sciences, historical, political, or economic!

There were eight other societies which held sessions at the same time, or jointly with the Association. They were the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, the Conference of State and Local Historical Societies, the Agricultural History Society, the American Society of Church History, the Mediaeval Academy of America, the American Political Science Association, the National Council for the Social Studies, and the East Tennessee Historical Society. The Political Science Association first met in Atlanta, and transferred its sessions to Chattanooga on December 29.

The attendance was unexpectedly large, with 602 registered. The sessions, often three or four at the same hour, had large audiences, some crowded to the doors. This is the best testimony that the program committee, of which Professor J. Fred Rippy was chairman, had done its work with clear comprehension of the claims of the many fields of study. As already intimated, a meeting in the South, and especially at Chattanooga, inevitably influenced its reflections. To Southern history were devoted a large variety of papers. The relation of Chattanooga to the Tennessee Valley Authority apparently did not direct equal attention to the New Deal. A general session, it is true, was given to the changes along the Tennessee River, illustrated through motion pictures and explained in an able address by Mr. David E. Lilienthal, director and general counsel of the Authority. It may seem surprising that there was no paper on the relations between the Supreme Court and the Con-

gress, a problem closely connected with the New Deal. Other problems of the moment had their share of attention, in particular foreign relations, dealt with retrospectively in the first general session, and the subject of a notable round-table discussion after the politiçal scientists had appeared on the scene. The fields into which historical studies are habitually grouped, Ancient, Medieval, Modern, English, Church, and Hispanic American, had their sessions too. Another characteristic of the program, accentuating a tendency exhibited in recent meetings, was making luncheons and dinners the occasion of presenting important papers or addresses. Some embarrassment was caused by the fact that at least one dinner preceding the first general session began so much later than the hour scheduled as to keep the general session waiting over half an hour.

The arrangements of the local committee, with Professor Culver H. Smith as chairman, were skillfully worked out. In order that there might be an adequate supply of rooms for sessions held simultaneously, two hotels were designated as headquarters. As they were only three blocks apart, this caused little inconvenience. The hospitalities of Chattanooga were generous. A smoker, a luncheon, and a reception and ball were offered by the University, open house by the President and Mrs. Guerry, who also entertained at breakfast those officially connected with the meeting and with the visiting bodies, and a tea by Mr. and Mrs. George Fort Milton. Through the courtesy of the Chattanooga Art Association there was an exhibition of the Tennessee Society of Artists, held in the art gallery of the University. The Local Committee had arranged for a conducted tour to Missionary Ridge, Lookout Mountain, and Chickamauga, but the weatherman declined to co-operate, and the whole countryside was blanketed with frozen slush on the chosen afternoon. The interest shown by the newspapers of Chattanooga, the *News* and the *Times,* was unique, as Professor Paxson remarked at the Annual Dinner of the Association. Extended quotations were made from many papers, and the address of Director Lilienthal was printed in full.

The Presidential Address, by Professor Rostovtzeff, had as its theme "The Hellenistic World and its Economic Development". It portrayed in a masterly manner the changing panorama of Alexander's empire, the successive scenes of material prosperity and decay, as political powers rose and sank, or felt the heavy hand of Rome. Those who heard this address, or read it in the January number of the *Review,* must have been reminded once more how the history of the Ancient World has been rewritten within a generation as a result of excavations and the

study of papyri. Perhaps they noted also that if the leader of Fascist Italy aims to duplicate the achievements of the elder Rome, the peoples standing in the path have unpleasant experiences ahead, for, said Dr. Rostovtzeff, the Roman administration was "always selfish and cruel". Even those states at first favored by Rome had a fate little better than out-and-out enemies. "Delos had been created by Rome, and it was Rome that destroyed Delos after it had played its appointed part. As soon as the reconstruction of Italian economic life made sufficient progress . . . Rome discarded Delos like an old rag. . . ."

The address at the Annual Dinner by Edgar E. Robinson was also illuminating. Speaking "In Praise of Newspapers", Professor Robinson closed with the words, "I propose, then, a toast to the newspaper—the revealing diary of a great people". The newspaper he regarded as the most important of all sources of social history. It is, he said, the combination of news story with advertisement, editorial, and general comment that has such value. The picture that may be drawn, for example, of California from 1844 to 1860, with the use of such sources "is one of unusual objectivity and glitters with a realism that even the lapse of eighty years does not dim". In the more general history of the country, in the period from 1890 to 1910, the editorial is "less revealing and the advertisement much more so". After 1910 the "Interpreter" becomes important. He is the writer of contemporary history. His success depends upon his clearness of mind, his knowledge, and his objectivity of attitude. "Unlike any other informed men of the time, they [the Interpreters] may speak their minds. They are not propagandists and they are not crusaders. They attempt to present the passing moment with the same impartiality, the same honesty, the same high purpose as the historian uses many years later."

The theme of the first general session was the "Foreign Relations of the United States". The first paper was presented by Thomas A. Bailey, in answer to the question, "Was the Presidential Election of 1900 a Mandate on Imperialism?" Professor Bailey pointed out that although the Democrats "announced that imperialism (which meant all things to all men) was the paramount issue", many other issues appeared to confuse the voter. The Republicans took the offensive with the old free silver bogey, contending that if Bryan once got into office the newly found prosperity and the full dinner pail would be lost. Even the anti-imperialists were so afraid of Bryan that they voted for McKinley. To them free silver was the more immediate danger. Professor Bailey's general conclusion was that because of partisan, personal, sectional, and

a host of other domestic considerations, our presidential elections have never been, and can never be, a mandate on any question of foreign policy. The second paper, "American Neutrality, 1914-1917", by Charles C. Tansill, was a bitter arraignment of Secretary Lansing, interspersed with humorous thrusts at all the characters in the play, not excepting President Wilson. Professor Tansill remarked that Lansing gave to diplomatic correspondence "a new turn by using it to delude his own countrymen into the false belief that he was insistent upon the protection of all American rights". The trouble with the Secretary, he suggested, was the use of a double standard in the protests he dispatched to the warring powers, language punctuated with thinly veiled threats when he was writing to Germany about the *Lusitania,* words resounding with nothing more terrifying than stage thunder when he addressed No. 10 Downing Street upon the disdainful treatment of neutral commerce. At the outset the Lansing briefs seem to have deceived the very elect, Ambassador Page and Sir Edward Grey. Page waxed indignant at the "library lawyers" in the Department of State, but "soon realized that Lansing was a mere diplomatic Jack-in-the-box whose first appearance gave Sir Edward Grey a brief fright but whose later appearances were merely a part in a puppet show". The fact was, and here few would dispute Professor Tansill, Mr. Lansing and President Wilson—as well as the majority of the American people—did not sympathize with the Germans and they did sympathize with the Allies. Notes to the British did not carry the sanction of war. The speaker thought Mr. Lansing's attitude apropos of the famous "black list" was especially significant. He was temporarily absent from his office and Frank L. Polk had to draft the protest. Polk wrote Lansing that "Personally, I think the time has come to stand up to" the British, adding that his own note to them should have had "a little more punch". Mr. Lansing replied, "It could not be made much stronger and be polite, and of course we must observe our manners." The final paper in the session dealt with the "Origins of American Intervention in North Russia, 1918". In it Dr. Leonid I. Strakhovsky explained that the Allied troops did not land at Murmansk until Trotsky, through Yuriev, head of the local soviet, had given an authorization. This was before Brest-Litovsk. Even after the Bolsheviks made peace with the Germans, rumors of submarines along the northern coast and of the advance of German troops in Finland led Trotsky to send "very secret" orders to Murmansk to invite the co-operation of the Allies. Late in June he was obliged to reverse himself, but Yuriev was by that time too completely committed and refused to comply. The futile

campaign which followed was not, therefore, wholly due to Allied blundering.

At the round table on foreign relations the discussion was opened by Samuel Flagg Bemis whose paper had been printed in the December *Yale Review,* with the title "A Clarifying Foreign Policy". Professor Bemis found that American foreign policy since the World War "had been settling back into the tradition of the Fathers", and was becoming "a policy of satiation, good will, peace, defense of the homeland, with an adequate navy . . . of 'tilling our own garden' (in the words of Charles Beard) . . . and of salvaging our foreign trade by making all possible tariff bargains with the other commercial nations of the world". It was the abandonment of such a continental policy in 1898, Dr. Bemis argued, that had led to a long series of blunders—the annexation of the Philippines, which had put us "unwittingly athwart the path of the rising empire of Japan", followed by the Open Door pronouncement, a "grandiose and sentimental floriation", our intervention in Asia by the Peace of Portsmouth, the Knox neutralization project for Manchuria, etc. Other blunders were made in the World War crisis, the failure to employ the weapon of the embargo to ensure our neutrality, and especially "the *unconditional* entry of the United States into full military and financial co-operation with the Allies". Although the speaker had once been an ardent advocate of our joining the League of Nations, he regarded it as fortunate, he confessed, that "domestic quarrels kept the United States out", awaiting the time when other great powers shall prove themselves "willing to make unselfish sacrifices to keep the peace all over the globe". He applauded the effort here to establish a program of neutrality, even if it meant abandonment of the doctrine of the Freedom of the Seas. In regard to Japan, toward which our foreign policy should focus, we should try to relieve the situation by the application of a quota law to Oriental immigration and by withdrawing from the Philippines with no strings tied to our agreement, but at the same time we should, for our own defense, always have a "navy adequately superior to that of Japan". The leaders of the general discussion, Quincy Wright and W. Stull Holt, dissented strongly from some of the positions assumed by Dr. Bemis. Professor Wright, whose paper was read by the chairman in his absence, expressed the opinion that from 1898 the question was whether we should use our influence as a great power in the direction of imperialism or internationalism. Roosevelt's name is associated with the one, Wilson's with the other. In any event we could not "vote ourselves out of the world". For the past three centuries

forces "have been creating a world community and according to every sane anticipation will continue to do so in spite of the frantic efforts of the Mussolinis, the Hitlers, the General Arakis, and the Charles Beards, to create security and prosperity within national areas. These efforts cannot succeed without a diminution of the standard of living and of the sense of political security of people everywhere so great that they will revolt." The causes of war Professor Wright found oftener in psychological phenomena, emotional states, and political expedients, rather than in the "economic mind looking for profits". But in "our industrial age economic reasons sound more rational". As to Professor Bemis's criticism of the Open Door in Asia, Dr. Wright saw in that simply an application of "unconditional most-favored-nation treatment in China". Furthermore, he did not accept Professor Bemis's proposal that we await evidence of unselfish action by the greater League powers before we should enter the League. He thought that enlightened self-interest was the fundamental assumption of the League, that "in every case of aggression it will be the interest of the most of the powers to discourage it . . . that there will always be at least one of the great powers to which the suppression of a particular aggression by another great power is so vital an interest that it will lead in the organization of sanctions". Professor Holt also could not accept the view that our present foreign policy was a clarification; on the contrary it exhibited "a growing confusion and entanglement in foreign affairs". Such, indeed, was the "race for naval supremacy over Japan" which Professor Bemis had advocated. The discussion all through was lively. Among the other speakers, Dr. J. Fred Rippy insisted that as long as we had a capitalistic system we were likely to struggle for world markets.

A paper on "Force and Policy", presented by Lieutenant Colonel J. M. Scammell in the joint session of the American Military History Foundation and the Association, threw interesting side lights upon questions of foreign policy. Colonel Scammell analyzed historically the part that force had played. He found that many times large armies were maintained primarily to secure domestic order. This was true even of Sparta. It is after all the politicians and not the soldiers who control preparations for war as well as the means of avoiding wars. Colonel Scammell also remarked that a history of wars which had seemed imminent but were avoided would "do much to enable us to forestall such conflicts as may, in their nature, be avoidable".[1]

[1] At this session Generalleutnant Friedrich von Boetticher, military attaché, German Embassy, read an interesting paper on "Washington and Frederick the Great".

The only paper in the sectional meetings which dealt directly with the New Deal was Professor Shannon's "Appraisal of the Appraisers" of the AAA. These he divided into six major groups each of which he characterized in a style refreshingly brisk. He expressed the opinion that the present administration was elected to save capitalism, not to establish socialism. He did not indicate whether the American people were conscious of such an intent in November, 1932, or whether they supposed they were simply expressing their disgust with another candidate. At all events the United States Chamber of Commerce, said Professor Shannon, is "too shortsighted to see" that the "whole AAA program is part of an effort to plug up the old capitalist ship sufficiently to keep it from sinking'. The only way that capitalism can be salvaged is by "curbing its predatory tendencies". The speaker also said that the "AAA is an attempt to manage agriculture like big business and all the policies followed have conformed closely to the business principle of regulating supply to meet demand, in an effort to produce profits". But, he intimated, miracles cannot be performed in a short time. The most that can be expected is a little better balance between the incomes of the various producing classes.

Of the papers which dealt with Southern history, two touched the problem of responsibility for the Civil War. Avery O. Craven gave "A Rural Interpretation of the Causes" of this war. Such a subject at a Luncheon Conference on Agricultural history occasioned a slight raising of the eyebrows on the part of some who had apparently forgotten the part that that royal plant, cotton, had played in the late unpleasantness. Professor Craven remarked at the outset that the reason why the sections went to war was "one of emotions, cultivated hostilities, and ultimately of hatred . . .". He added that the conflict was also the "work of politicians and pious cranks. The people knew little of each other as realities. They were each fighting mythical devils". Except for Garrison and Company the troublemakers appear to have operated chiefly in the Old Northwest, where the democratic movement and the religious revival had been strongest since Jackson's reign. There the farmer was the principal figure and there developed the most vocal discontent with the distribution of wealth and privilege which came in the trail of the industrial revolution, and with the consequent growth of Eastern manufacturing towns and marts of commerce. The workingmen and farmers were sure that they were not getting a square deal. To them the capitalistic magnate was an aristocrat, a traitor to true democracy. Such enemies, as so often in the history of the world, became the enemies of

God. The politicians pointed out the Southern planter, with his droves of slaves, as the "great symbol of aristocracy, of immorality, and of disloyalty to democratic government". "In a surprisingly short time all Southerners except a few 'poor whites' were planters". The Southern leaders seemed to justify this conclusion by opposing the adoption of a homestead law and by contending that the territories remain open to slavery. Most of Professor Craven's attention was concentrated on Northern fanatics and politicians, not forgetting Lincoln, although he made passing mention of Southern fire-eaters and secessionists, with the consequence that the North was left with the principal responsibility for the next stage of the tragedy, conflict in arms.

Upon the North also, or rather upon Abraham Lincoln, was placed the responsibility for the outbreak of hostilities between the two sections. This was the contention of Charles W. Ramsdell in his address entitled "Lincoln and Fort Sumter", given at the dinner of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. The political leaders on both sides in 1861, Professor Ramsdell pointed out, fully recognized the moral value of a defensive role in such a struggle. He explained that Lincoln, with no idea either of recognizing the Confederacy or of willingly abandoning to it—or the states which had formed it—the forts or other property of the Federal government, had as his problem to place the onus of aggression upon the Southern governments. In his summary of the events which preceded the inauguration Professor Ramsdell alluded to the seizure by the Southern states of forts, navy yards, and arsenals within their borders. About these acts there was nothing spectacular, nothing to strike public opinion either North or South, although they were acts of aggression from the national point of view. Doubtless, Professor Ramsdell would not so describe them. To these seizures there were two exceptions, Fort Pickens at Pensacola and Fort Sumter in Charleston harbor. It was Fort Sumter, explained the speaker, which seemed to embody the whole question in such a manner that the eyes of all, South as well as North, were fixed upon its grim walls. "To the Washington officials Sumter was not merely the legal property of the Federal Government: its possession was a symbol of the continuity and integrity of that government. To withdraw the garrison at the demand of the secessionists would be equivalent to acknowledging the legality of secession and the dissolution of the Union." On the other hand the Confederacy, now regarding itself as an independent nation, could not maintain "its own selfrespect or the respect of foreign governments if it permitted another government to hold an armed fortress within the harbor of one

of its principal cities". Sentiment and opinion in neither the North nor the South was united upon what should be the next step. Governor Pickens of South Carolina was eager to reduce the fort, but the Montgomery government believed that a policy of watchful waiting was essential. Lincoln had to bear in mind the divisions in the North and the Border states. Professor Ramsdell attributed to him an uncanny skill in dealing with them, especially through official letters and public utterances, which were so phrased "as to arouse in each special group he singled out for attention just the reaction he desired". He gave such emphasis to Lincoln's cleverness as a maneuverer with phrases that he seemed to charge him with duplicity and to deny him the excuse of being obliged to feel his way through a labyrinth of factional suspicions and antagonisms. The crisis came in March. The speaker declared that "at some time, while turning these things over in his mind, this daring thought must have occurred to Lincoln: Could the Southerners be induced to attack Sumter, to assume the aggressive and thus put themselves in the wrong in the eyes of the North and the World". It is impossible here even to summarize the evidence for the thesis which Professor Ramsdell adduced, but in his judgment the supreme stroke was the expedition to carry relief to Major Anderson, after Lincoln had become convinced through the secret mission of Ward H. Lamon that for Governor Pickens *"any sort* of relief . . . would result in an attack on Fort Sumter". Lincoln's letter of notification to Governor Pickens was so ingeniously worded (another Ems Dispatch, intimated Professor Ramsdell) that the North would regard the expedition as an effort to feed a hungry and beleaguered garrison, while the South would regard it as a challenge, an announced determination to hold the fort permanently. Professor Ramsdell's closing words were:

> Some will wonder whether the sense of responsibility for the actual beginning of a frightful war, far more terrible than he could have foreseen in that early April of 1861, may have deepened the melancholy and the charity toward his Southern foemen which that strange man in the White House was to reveal so often before that final tragic April of 1865.

Two papers and a round-table discussion added important contributions to the history of the Confederacy. One, entitled "Chattanooga as an Ante-bellum Railway Center", by T. D. Clark, showed clearly why that city and the country round about were the scene of fierce struggles in 1863. By 1860, Dr. Clark explained, it had become the most important rail center in the South. It was the natural gateway through the Appalachians. Rival settlements had little chance for chief honors in

transportation when topography took sides with Ross's Landing at the base of Lookout Mountain. Another paper, by Courtney R. Hall, dealt with the "Influence of the Medical Department upon Confederate War Operations". The chief figure in this important service was Major Samuel Preston Moore, who had had sixteen years' experience as an army surgeon when the Civil War broke out. He was made surgeon general in June, 1861. The most formidable difficulty with which he had to cope was the lack of medical supplies. His great hospital near Richmond consisted of 150 one-story buildings. It was so well managed that out of 77,000 patients 70,000 were returned to duty. Taking the war as a whole, disease, Dr. Hall said, rather than wounds, was the army's worst enemy. In the first year of the war an average of three illnesses per man were recorded. Troops were sent into the woods for berries, roots, and vegetables, to reduce the list of men sick with scurvy. The round table had as its subject the problems of the Confederate government. Professor Ramsdell sketched the history of the Western Department which after the fall of Vicksburg became virtually a little Confederacy, with only sporadic connections with the Richmond administration. Major William A. Robinson, jr., gave much information about the courts of the Confederacy, drawn from his discoveries of many records supposedly lost. A comparison of the two constitutions, Federal and Confederate, was made by Professor Irby Hudson.[2]

The later history of the South was the subject of two striking papers presented in the session on Recent History of the United States: "From Tillman to Long", by Daniel M. Robison; and "Claude Kitchin and the Wilson War Policies", by A. M. Arnett. Professor Robison began by declaring the prevailing notion that the "South once enjoyed aristo-

[2] The earlier South was also touched upon during the meetings. In the session on Agricultural History T. P. Abernethy discussed the problems of "Virginia's Western Lands", and combated the common belief that the prospect of losing her lands through the grant of a charter to the Vandalia Company had anything to do with her stand for independence. He said that it was well known in 1775 that the charter would not pass the seals, while independence was not seriously considered until 1776. He also discussed the scheme of Robert Morris and other influential men at the time of the negotiations for peace to give up the Western lands and obtain Canada. Morris appears to have feared an increase in the power of the Southern states. Still another phase of Southern history was studied in the session of the American Society of Church History, on the "Advance of Methodism in the Lower Southwest", by Walter B. Posey. The story is one of patience, persistence, and self-sacrifice. It also includes a runaway marriage, a series of two thousand earthquakes in three months, and the rise of the price of cotton to thirty-four cents. The marrying circuit rider afterwards exchanged the gospel for the law. During the earthquake year converts rose from 789 to 1307. The high price of cotton helped the church budgets. Thirty-four cent cotton also emphasized the slavery question, but the preachers in the lower Mississippi Valley were "discreet". Not a reference to slavery in any form can be found in the Journal of the Mississippi Conference.

cratic statesmanship and now suffers demagoguery" to rest upon two questionable assumptions, first, that the older political leaders were drawn from the slaveholding aristocracy, and, second, that leaders like 'Pitchfork' Tillman, Tom Watson, James K. Vardaman, and Huey Long were noisy demagogues, with nothing of the constructive statesman about them. Professor Robison explained that the legend of aristocratic rule in the ante bellum South was shattered by facts drawn from biographical sketches of those who held high office from 1828 to 1860. Not more than a third came from the class with large plantations. The great majority belonged to the middle class. That there was no body of men long in the political saddle is indicated by statistics. The "average tenure of a United States senator was 5.8 years, and of a congressman 4.3, that of a governor 2.8 years". There was no difference of interest between the small farmer and the planter; each was agrarian. When after the war industry came in, the older "Bourbon" families sought to re-establish their fortunes through it. They ceased to furnish even their share of leaders to the agriculturalists. The farmer would have deserted them earlier than he did but for the Negro question. Moreover, the conservatives used the Negro votes to overcome agrarian majorities. Consequently the farmers had to find new leaders. Nor were these leaders illiterates; most of them had university training. Their use of new and startling methods of campaigning was due to the fact that all the usual organs of publicity, press and pulpit, were opposed to them. Their own methods of publicity were highly individualistic. Once they were in office, however, they made a record of sound administrative and legislative measures.[3]

The interest of Professor Arnett's paper upon Congressman Kitchin was due to the light it threw upon the relations of the group to which Kitchin belonged, including Champ Clark and 'Gumshoe' Stone,

[3] At the round table on "Demagogues Past and Present" Huey Long's career was analyzed in detail by George M. Reynolds, a former Louisianian, for fifteen years a friend of the late dictator. He regarded Long as the ablest politician the South had produced since the Civil War. He may have utilized class jealousies but not race hatred, because he had political ambitions beyond Louisiana. He realized that wealth could not be shared, but he was ready "to use the power of the state to minimize the difference between people's wealth". Meanwhile the slogan "Share the wealth" was a masterpiece of political strategy. At the same round table demagogues from Philip van Arteveldt to Hitler were discussed. Professor Robert C. Brooks defined the demagogue as a "leader of masses of the people, that is, of the poor and underprivileged people. As such, he and his followers are arrayed against the privileged". As these persons control publicity he becomes the butt of ridicule. Dr. Brooks suggested the coinage of a new word "Oligogue", to describe anti-democratic leaders "who mislead the masses in a different direction". He produced a list of forty or fifty demagogues, compiled after a plebiscite of trustworthy correspondents. The list was sensational enough to be printed in full in one of the Chattanooga papers.

to Wilson's neutrality policy, his preparedness campaign, and later to his decision that the United States should declare war on Germany. From his youth with its memories of the consequences to North Carolina of the Civil War and Reconstruction Kitchin had two hatreds, easily explainable, that of war and of the Republican party. He was an agrarian in the time of the Farmers' Alliance and afterwards a Bryan Democrat. He favored Wilson's nomination and supported the progressive measures of Wilson's first two years in office. He would not support the preparedness drive and was critical of what he regarded as Wilson's unneutral neutrality. In his interviews with Wilson in February, 1916, he became convinced that the President was anxious for war with Germany. One of his remarks, apropos of the campaign of 1916, was that Wilson "didn't keep us out of war; we kept him out of war!" When war actually broke out Kitchin determined that its burden should rest upon the big corporations and swollen fortunes which found the war so profitable. He did not say that the "North should be made to pay". His attitude was misrepresented and the false impressions, then created, said Professor Arnett, have never been effectively removed from the public mind. Professor Arnett's study, which is to conclude in a biography of Kitchin, has been made from the Kitchin papers preserved in the library of the University of North Carolina.

We may now turn to the papers on particular fields of study. The section on Ancient history had the privilege of listening to Dr. Rostovtzeff's account of the Yale excavations at Dura-Europos, in which he has had so notable a share. Professor A. E. R. Boak also gave an interesting description of the Michigan excavations in Egypt and Mesopotamia, while Professor N. C. Debevoise explained those of the Oriental Institute. These addresses were illustrated.

The medievalists had a session and a dinner. At the dinner they were addressed by J. L. La Monte on "A Franco-Syrian Gentleman in the Age of the Crusades: John d'Ibelin, the Old Lord of Beirut". He was, said Professor La Monte, the chief baron of 'Outremer' at the time of the crusade of Frederick II. Between him and Frederick arose a long struggle over the control of Cyprus. Ibelin was careful to fulfill to the letter his feudal obligations, but would not yield a point beyond. The later tradition of the East represented him as the model of chivalry and the defender of the rights of the baronage. In the first of the three papers[4] at the session David K. Bjork discussed "Piracy in the Baltic,

[4] The third paper was "Some Phases of Municipal Development in the Towns of the Fairs of Champagne", by Elizabeth Chapin.

1375-1398", showing that it was a weapon used by Queen Margaret of Norway and the duke of Mecklenburg in their conflict over the Danish throne and for the control of Sweden. Piracy was used also by Denmark to reduce the hold of the Hanseatic League upon Scandinavian trade. The principal sufferers were the merchants of the league. In another paper Charles H. Taylor explained "Some Aspects of Early Representative Institutions in France". His paper had largely to do with evidence drawn from the history of Languedoc. Professor Taylor remarked that in the case of France there had been little effort to study the background of representative action, the rules and concepts governing the use of representative agents. In southern France these agents were proctors and syndics, acting for communities considered, for this purpose at least, as corporations. The seigniors were doubtful about recognizing such a corporate status, fearing its implications. At all events by the time of Philip the Fair many rural communities in the South were ready to understand a summons to a representative assembly.

To Modern European history were devoted two sessions, the first on the early period. An address on "Changes of Standards in the Sixteenth Century", by Roland H. Bainton, was followed by a discussion in which S. Harrison Thomson, James Westfall Thompson, and others took part. Professor Bainton, drawing upon a wide familiarity with the recent work of scholars in half a dozen languages, reinterpreted one category of experience after another. The well-known figures of the Renaissance and Reformation appeared in new relationships and with some changes of significance. The speaker held that the sixteenth century was peculiarly in search of new standards, in the sense of a new grip on thought and life, because late Scholasticism was sterile, and no serious displacement or rebirth of the spiritual world of the Middle Ages had been attained by the radical Franciscans, the Northern mystics, or the Humanists. This Luther achieved, and the outcome was the arrest of secularization for roughly a century and a half. Among many other views, it is interesting to note that Professor Bainton pointed out the unsoundness of Fanfani's argument that Protestantism aided in the rise of capitalism by releasing economics from the control of religion.

The subject of the second session on Modern European history was "The Crisis of Federative Polity in Europe, 1858-1863" and the leader of the discussion was Robert C. Binkley. Professor Binkley first emphasized the importance of the fundamental postulates which shape the organization and treatment of historical material. The two which have exercised most influence assume that the state is the only sovereignty

possessed of supreme lawmaking power, and that particular area units, coinciding with national states or dynastic empires, alone offer the scene proper to political history. According to these assumptions a federation like that in Germany from 1815 to 1866 was unsubstantial and transitory. Bismarck was, therefore, the founder, not the destroyer of German unity. The Vienna school of Alfred Verdross would regard the world's legal order as a hierarchy, with international law at the top, constitutional law next below it, then statute law, and finally administrative decrees and judicial decisions. Under this assumption a federation would be as legitimate a unit of government as a national state. Accordingly, the most critical period of nineteenth century history is the four years from 1858 to 1863, when schemes of federation were being attempted from the Rhine to the Niemen, and from the Baltic to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. Professor Binkley regarded the old German Confederation as a living and vital organization, with capacities for growth not unlike those of the United States under its constitution of 1789. The various experiments in federative polity in Europe were far beyond the mere level of pamphleteering; they were undertaken through actual laws or treaties, or foreign policies laid down in diplomatic documents. Federation in the United States survived the crisis of 1861-1865, while at the same time in Europe it broke down, presenting interesting contrasts of experience. Among those who discussed Professor Binkley's paper were Lawrence D. Steefel, O. H. Wedel, and Hans Rosenberg.[5]

The papers in the English history section were centered upon aspects of Church history, the administration of Laud, the political activity of churchmen in the Age of Anne, and the Oxford Movement.[6] Professor A. H. Sweet said that at the time of the Oxford Movement there was a feeling that the Anglican Church was imperfectly conscious of its responsibilities and a widespread apprehension that a great apostasy was at hand. The authors of the movement taught implicitly that there was a "Divine Society" independent of the secular power, and their ideas

[5] The political scientists united with the historians in a round-table discussion of the "Historical Approach to Political Science". Papers were read on questions of method, and as a result of the discussion the members present resolved to secure more active collaboration between historians and political scientists especially in studying the field of local government in the United States. It may be recalled that under Herbert B. Adams the Johns Hopkins graduate students of a generation ago pursued such investigations with notable success, as bibliographies of American history and political science can testify. At the dinner of the Modern history group addresses were made by Professors Bernadotte E. Schmitt, Guy Stanton Ford, Frederick B. Artz, Arthur L. Cross, and Waldemar Westergaard.

[6] The papers were: "Laud and the Church of England", by E. R. Adair; "The Political Activity of the Anglican Church, 1700-1715", by W. T. Morgan; "Some Aspects of the Oxford Movement", by A. H. Sweet.

still have potential value in counteracting theories of an omnicompetent, infallible state. Some aspects of Church history in the United States were dealt with in a joint session of the Association and the American Society of Church History.[7]

A subject from earlier American history, of particular interest to this journal after its recent publication of a critical study of Braddock's Defeat, was presented in the session of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association by E. Douglas Branch under the title of "The Administration of a Wilderness Army". The army in question was that which General John Forbes commanded in the second and successful campaign against Fort Duquesne. Professor Branch was mainly concerned, as his title suggests, with the attendant problems, roadbuilding, the commissariat, amalgamation of provincial and regular troops, and their conversion by Colonel Henry Bouquet into an army trained in both orthodox and wilderness warfare. The advance was hindered by lack of detailed knowledge of the topography of the region. To one familiar with the physical characteristics of the route the difficulties must seem formidable. Professor Branch expressed the opinion that in the later weeks of the campaign Colonel George Washington furnished some "dynamic propulsion". The other two papers dealt with the Southwest: "The Odyssey of Kit Carson", by Dr. Milo M. Quaife, and "The Route of the Texas-Santa Fe Expedition", by Professor Horace B. Carroll.

Spanish America and the Far East each had a section. In speaking of the trade with Spanish America, Osgood Hardy called attention to the surprising fact that during the depression our share of Latin American imports did not fall off, while the exports of the sister republics to us decreased relatively a small amount. From this he argued that our large trade with them rested on a solid foundation, and was not simply an incident of the World War period. Another speaker in this section, Lesley B. Simpson, dealt with the labor problem in colonial Mexico and Guatemala after the abolition of slavery. As a substitute for slave labor the "repartimiento" system of forced labor, with pay, broke down in underground mines and other industries where special skill was required. It was still employed, however, in building towns, countless churches and convents. It also flourished in agriculture.[8] In the Far

[7] In addition to Professor Posey's paper, referred to in note 2, the papers were "Hostility of Early American Methodists to Theological Schools", by Paul N. Garber, and "An Ecclesiastical Development among Baptists and Methodists", by Robert W. Goodloe.

[8] The titles of these papers were "The Repartimiento System in Guatemala and Mexico" and "The Influence of the Depression upon Hispanic-American Trade with the United States". Professor Charles W. Hackett also presented a paper on "*Visitador* Rivera's Criticisms of Aguayo's Work in Texas". He explained that these criticisms were made

East section John W. Stanton commented on the many Russian diplomatic missions to Peking during the eighteenth century. For this there were two reasons. The economic life of Eastern Siberia depended upon the sale of furs in the neighboring state. Furthermore, the expansion of China westward had been at the expense of the Russians and Mongols, and boundary conventions were necessary. Another paper, by Thomas E. Ennis, described "The Theory and Practice of Overseas Rule in the Orient". Dr. Ennis found that the British showed a careful regard for colonial individuality, while the French although professing to exchange a policy of assimilation for that of association had made few moves in Indo-China to bring about co-operation between ruler and ruled.[9]

Of the papers which dealt with the history of agriculture the one which covered the greatest sweep of human experience or ingenuity was Russell H. Anderson's account of "The Grain Drill—from Babylon to America". Dr. Anderson said that with our present knowledge "the earliest fabricated grain drill was that portrayed on a Babylonian clay tablet dating from 1316 B.C., the fourth year of the reign of Nazi-Marrutash II". It was a modification of the early Babylonian plow, and contained two of the "three essential elements of a successful grain drill". "The third element, the revolving seed dropping device was, apparently, not found until some 2900 years later", in 1580 A.D., when Tadeo Cavalini added such a device, crude to be sure, but containing elements not unlike those figured out by the great Jethro Tull. We would gladly exchange the name of King Nazi-Marrutash for that of his humble subject who devised that first drill. Another paper in the same session, "Frontier Economy in Southwestern Pennsylvania", by Solon J. Buck, analyzed the successive economies of the region from its first settlement after the close of the French and Indian War until the last decade of the eighteenth century. Dr. Buck expressed his surprise at the number of settlers—about forty thousand—within the first eight or ten years in spite of the isolation of the district. Not a few of these so relished life in the wilderness that they drifted farther west. It

when the Spanish government had under consideration Aguayo's recommendation to send four hundred families of colonists to Texas. Rivera not only opposed this as an unwise expenditure of public funds but attacked practically all Aguayo's claims as to the results of his expedition of 1721-1722. Professor Hackett remarked, however, that despite these criticisms the work of the marquis was highly constructive. He left in Texas four presidios, instead of one when he entered, and ten missions instead of only two. Dr. John Tate Lanning, at the luncheon conference on Hispanic American History, outlined the "Research Possibilities in the Cultural History of Colonial Spanish America".

[9] A third paper was read by Paul H. Clyde on "America, Japan, and the Chinese Eastern Railway".

was only the third tide of immigrants, perhaps the third generation of the same family, that was able to develop a farm to the state in which it produced much surplus. By this time home industries flourished, and later diverse activities, sawmills, boat yards, blacksmith shops, flour mills, and fulling mills, then blast furnaces, bloomeries, paper mills, and glass factories. "In approximately a third of a century a numerous human society, well supplied with capital goods and equipped with a complex economic structure, had been established in what had previously been a wilderness." [10]

In view of the approaching completion of the *Dictionary of American Biography* it was peculiarly appropriate that one session should be given to the general subject of biography. This was in the form of a round-table discussion. W. H. Stephenson, the chairman, referred to the stimulus to biographical writing in this country which had come from the *D. A. B.* The discussion then turned to the need of real biographies of the "titans of industry" and of political bosses. The difficulty which in each case confronted the biographer was the disappearance or destruction of the records. Dr. Max Lerner expressed the opinion that a signal opportunity was ready to the hand of those biographers who would not "prettify", but would describe, perhaps even praise, the titans of industry, "those monstrous heroes . . . the men who have ripped open a continent—the men who have been at once builders and destroyers". In Professor Harold Zink's opinion political bosses are a subject quite as important as industrial magnates. The study of such figures would be advanced if graduate students from other countries could be persuaded to undertake inquiries upon the careers of similar men in their own countries. Mrs. Jeannette P. Nichols remarked upon the importance of recognizing the presence of inconsistency in human beings, otherwise truth is distorted and biography becomes useless. The value of personal detail, of conditions of life and of inheritance, was emphasized by Dr. Katharine E. Crane, of the *Dictionary*. A. Howard Meneely described his course in biography at Dartmouth College, one of the few of this type.

"Civil Liberties" was the subject of a round-table discussion which had its tense moments, for a Georgia representative of the American Legion defended its vigilante activities and was subjected to a crossfire of hypothetical questions from some of the historians and the political scientists. In a luncheon conference of the National Council for the

[10] A third paper on "The Introduction of Red Clover into the United States" was read by Mary R. Burr, of the Department of Agriculture. Professor Abernethy's paper, already mentioned (n. 2), was also read in this session.

Social Studies a paper by Howard Cummings touched upon another phase of the same situation, the danger that historical textbooks were promoting race hatreds by emphasizing the necessity of laws restricting immigration, and by marking the immigration from southeastern Europe as definitely inferior to the earlier immigration from Western and Northern Europe. To call much attention to the failure of democracy was, he thought, to promote fascism.[11]

There were also conferences of archivists and of representatives of state and local historical societies. The archivists decided to form an association of their own and took the first steps toward such a goal. At the conference of the historical societies Dr. Clarence E. Carter commented on the "Historical Publications of the United States Government", and Vernon D. Tate explained "Micro-filming as an Aid to Research". Dr. Tate said that it is primarily useful for note taking and extensive copying. He added that the unit cost is so low that entire volumes and letter files may be copied more cheaply than brief notes can be made by hand. Christopher B. Coleman discussed the "Relation of State and Local Historical Agencies to the American Historical Association" and urged that a serious effort be made to realize some practicable plan of affiliation between the more effective societies and the Association. Only in this way can the cause of historical studies and publications be well served. One consequence would be that the weaker societies could be helped to raise their standards of activity.[12]

The annual business meeting was brief. The Treasurer's report had already been sent out with the programs. The Secretary commented upon the work of the Council and of the Executive Committee, and the Executive Secretary interpreted plans for future activities. The winner of the John H. Dunning Prize was Miss Angie Debo, for a book entitled *The Rise and Fall of the Choctaw Republic* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1934; see *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XL, 795). The officers chosen for 1936 are: Charles H. McIlwain, president; Guy Stanton Ford, first vice-president; Laurence M. Larson, second vice-president; Dexter Perkins, secretary; and Constantine E. McGuire, treasurer. The new members of the

[11] At this luncheon a second paper on "The Besetting Sin of Pedagogy" was read by Professor Edgar B. Wesley. A session on "The Teaching of History" followed the luncheon. In this Dr. J. L. Cate read a paper on "An Introductory General Course in the Humanities", and Professor Troyer S. Anderson read a second on "Honors Work in History at Swarthmore".

[12] There was also a luncheon conference of the editors of historical publications, at which Professor W. H. Stephenson discussed the plans of the Southern Historical Association and the *Journal of Southern History*. Professor Walter Prichard also spoke of the problems of the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*.

Council are Frederick Merk, Bessie L. Pierce, and R. D. W. Connor, the last to fill the unexpired term of the late James F. Willard. A. E. R. Boak and Preserved Smith were chosen to fill the vacancies on the Board of Editors caused by the expiration of the terms of Tenney Frank and James Westfall Thompson. The meeting for 1936 is to be held at Providence.[13]

The closing function of the whole meeting left a happy impression upon those—and they were many—whose train schedules or automobile plans enabled them to accept the hospitality of the University for a luncheon on Monday. The postprandial orators were Stringfellow Barr and Charles H. McIlwain, and their subject was "Reviewers Reviewed". Professor Barr entertained his hearers with a witty sketch or imaginary conversation between Professor Brown, reviewer of Professor Black's opus, and Professor Red, veteran annotator of the faults of others. The volume by Professor Black presented to the reviewer many difficulties, among which was the fact that the "only original part of it was the index". Professor McIlwain leveled his shafts of humorous comment or stern judgment at the managing editors. The shafts were doubtless pertinent to the subject, at all events they hit the mark.

H. E. B.

[13] For the Report of the Executive Secretary and a list of officers and committees, see Historical News.

MEDICAL SOURCES AND THE SOCIAL HISTORIAN [1]

It is a truism that limitations are set upon historical research by the nature of the sources available. The fact that certain materials necessary to the study of European history are inaccessible to the American student has doubtless prevented some studies in that field. It is not so generally recognized that materials are rendered just as inaccessible by habits of mind as by great distances. Indeed mental barriers usually prove more difficult to surmount than the merely geographical ones. Newspapers were long stacked in divers places, for example, before John Bach McMaster first thought of using them in the preparation of his studies in American history. Since the files reposed in newspaper offices or in private homes, to which historians were not accustomed to go, the papers were practically inaccessible to the profession.

This situation was unfortunate, not only because various facts escaped the historian, but because new vistas in historiography likewise eluded him. When McMaster was asked how he happened to include the social data for which his history was famous, he replied that he simply "put in what was in the papers". If his recollection was correct, it was a fortunate selection of a new type of source, rather than any preconceived theory, which led him to write the "new history".

Since the appearance of the first volume of the *History of the People of the United States,* there has been some further extension in the range of sources frequently employed by historians. It is interesting to recall that while McMaster was examining the newspaper files, his colleague, Professor Cheyney, was extending his research into the more general literary sources. Cheyney decided, writes Professor Conyers Read, "long before the great mass of us . . . that the arts, and particularly literature, constituted the largest source of material for history in the broad sense, and he made extensive use of them while most of us were limiting our attention to the State Papers, just as though there were not more of Tudor England in Shakespeare than in all the documents combined". [2]

In this manner, one type of source material after another has come within the range of historical investigations. Today historians are justly proud of their catholicity in this respect. A useful chain has been created,

[1] A paper read at the meeting of the History of Science Society in Washington, D. C., Dec. 29, 1934.

[2] "Edward Potts Cheyney: As a Writer", in William E. Lingelbach, ed., *Portrait of an Historian* (Philadelphia, 1935), p. 22.

in which more varied sources have suggested wider interests, and the latter in turn have promoted a search for still other sources. The need of such a chain of suggestion becomes at once apparent when the work of general historians is contrasted with that of those devoted to such specialized subjects as the history of medicine, of architecture, or of engineering. The tendency among the latter, at least until very recently, has been to consult only the technical literature in their respective fields.

As if in deference to such specialists, the one type of material still neglected by general historians is the technical literature. This is notably true in the case of the history of science. Materials reposing only a few yards from the historian's office, are for all practical purposes ten thousand miles away, simply because they are within buildings occupied by the professional schools. Most historians are not accustomed to pursue their researches in these institutions. To the extent that the scholar's training does not equip him to use technical materials, he is in a sense justified in this attitude—although a new training program is obviously indicated in this connection.[3] Pending the acquisition of such training, there is still considerable material in technical sources which is intelligible to any capable historian.

It may be that the neglect of scientific literature is due not so much to deference as to indifference. As historians become interested in the cultural significance of science—which certainly looms so large on the intellectual horizon that it can no longer be minimized—they will doubtless employ technical sources. Harvey's papers are just as accessible as Cromwell's—those of Benjamin Rush just as readable as the outpourings of his friend Thomas Jefferson. Much technical literature will doubtless come into its own in this fashion, as the story of science assumes the place it should have in the synthesis which is general history.

The point to be stressed here, however, is not this inevitable recognition of the history of science. It is rather the fact that scientific sources are pertinent to those phases of history already included in all general

[3] A fact formally recognized in the report of a recent committee on the planning of research, submitted to the American Historical Association (*Historical Scholarship in America*, New York, 1932, p. 31). Such training will tend to integrate the work of general historians with that of those working in special fields. In so far as the process is already under way, it is being approached from the other end as well; that is, such specialists as the medical historians are beginning to be trained in general history, and to use general historical sources. The most promising training program of this sort, in the United States, is that of the Institute of Medical History at the Johns Hopkins University. For a current example of the use of general sources by a medical historian, see Sanford V. Larkey, M. D., "Public Health in Tudor England", *Am. Jour. of Pub. Health*, XXIV, 1099 ff. (New York, 1934). Such medical historians as Arturo Castiglioni, Paul Diepgen, and Henry E. Sigerist are much interested, at the present time, in integrating medical history with social and cultural developments.

narratives, for the actual development of certain sciences possesses social implications of the first order. In no case is this more true than in the history of the vital and far-reaching medical sciences.

There is, to begin with, the history of disease. It is scarcely necessary to labor the point of its social significance. Nor is it necessary, in making this point, to subscribe to the extreme view that whole civilizations waxed and waned simply because of disease variations. What must be recognized is that the history of certain regions has inevitably been conditioned by the diseases obtaining therein. Historians always realized this in the case of great epidemics, and medical historians encouraged them here by emphasizing the story of such disasters. It is easier to find records of a sudden "visitation" than it is to trace obscure, endemic conditions; and once written, the former makes more spectacular reading. Hence the universal attention accorded "the Black Death". Hence also the neglect of contemporary endemic diseases, which in the long run were more fatal and perhaps equally significant in their social consequences.[4]

In Angelo Celli's recently published *History of Malaria in the Roman Campagna,* there is at last made available a great mass of historical evidence demonstrating a direct correlation between malaria and decadence in that region—a correlation that assumes obvious significance as one looks back across the centuries. In England and in the United States there are as yet available only fragmentary data and plausible hypotheses concerning the historic role of endemic disease. It is inconceivable, however, that so insidious and deadly an enemy as tuberculosis did not play its part in nineteenth century England; or that malaria, pellagra, and hookworm infection have exerted no influence in America. The latter ills may well account for some of the backwardness of certain Southern sections, and for the so-called "laziness" of certain Southern peoples.

The sources for this phase of English and of American social history lie buried in various places, but are chiefly available in the medical literature. Not much secondary material is to be found, save in brief introductions to books on particular diseases. The standard works of Hirsch and Creighton[5] relate primarily to epidemics; and the pioneer historical studies of American diseases were of the same character. Thus the versatile Noah Webster wrote voluminously of our native epidemics, the accounts of which he based upon extensive "researches among revolv-

[4] Mazÿck P. Ravenel, "Endemic Diseases vs. Acute Epidemics", *Am. Jour. of Pub. Health,* X (1920), 761 ff.

[5] August Hirsch, *Handbook of Geographical and Historical Pathology,* tr. by Charles Creighton (London, 1883–1886); Charles Creighton, *History of Epidemics in Britain* (Cambridge, 1891–1894).

ing planets, blazing comets, [and] exploding volcanoes".[6] He made some interesting observations in spite of his astrological leanings, and it is the writer's private opinion that when he turned to lexicography, he was a good epidemiologist "gone wrong".

Even before Webster wrote, Lionel Chalmers had published his essay on the diseases of South Carolina (1776); and William Currie had brought out the first American attempt at medical geography; that is, his *Historical Account of the Climates and Diseases of the United States of America,* published at Philadelphia in 1792. It is interesting to observe, in passing, that this was the same year in which appeared the first volume of L. L. Finkę's treatise, which is usually considered the first formal work on medical geography.[7] About a decade later (1801) there appeared, at Charleston, what was probably the first serious attempt in medical historiography published in this country. This was David Ramsay's *Review of the Improvements, Progress, and State of Medicine in the XVIIIth Century,* which included a narrative of the Charleston epidemics of that period.[8] Currie later published two other books on the history and geography of American diseases; the second of which—*A View of the Diseases Most Prevalent in the United States of America* (Philadelphia, 1811)—was the best thing of its kind for this country. The dramatic essays of Benjamin Rush on the Philadelphia fevers may also be recalled.

Endemic diseases received some attention in Currie's works; but the first strictly historical study along this line, in the United States, seems to have been the work of no less a luminary than Oliver Wendell Holmes. Holmes was much concerned, as a young man, lest the records of New England diseases be entirely lost. He went over early accounts of malaria page by page—omitting, he declared, only "some few ecclesiastical papers . . . of Cotton Mather, which being more likely to cause a fever than to mention one, I left to some future investigator". His "Dissertation on Intermittent Fever in New England" won the Boylston prize in 1838, but has long since been largely forgotten.[9]

While a well-considered historical paper of this sort was exceptional [10]

[6] *Epidemic and Pestilential Diseases* (2 vols., Hartford, 1799). The phrase is from William Currie, *A Sketch of the Rise and Progress of the Yellow Fever* (Philadelphia, 1800), p. 47.

[7] Leonhard Ludwig Finke, *Versuch einer allgemeinen medicinisch-praktischen Geographie* (3 vols., Leipzig, 1792–1795).

[8] See pp. 35 ff. This is a most interesting essay, and is typical of the period. Present readers may be surprised to find that eighteenth century writers were just as optimistic about "the triumphs of modern medicine" as anyone is today.

[9] Published in the *Boylston Prize Dissertations* (Boston, 1838), pp. 1 ff.

[10] It is interesting to note that Holmes was trained in Louis's seminar at Paris, and

—and indeed still is—there was no lack of primary comment in the medical literature on malaria and various other endemic diseases. Professional journals and the transactions of professional societies in all parts of the country were replete, during the first half of the nineteenth century, with accounts of the usual "fevers"[11]; and special regions reported in addition on such diseases as were more or less peculiar to them. Western physicians, for example, had much to say of "milk sickness"; while Southern doctors expressed concern over the mysterious *cachexia africana* that devastated the plantations of Louisiana and of the West Indies.

The unsatisfactory nosography of the period renders the use of these reports difficult, since disease classification still rested, as late as 1860, on a symptom-complex or at best on a pathological basis. There has, in consequence, been some disagreement as to what diseases were primarily involved in given instances, particularly during the earlier periods. Holmes in writing of early New England, and contemporary historians describing seventeenth century Virginia, have agreed that malaria was the chief bane of the founding fathers.[12] Heagerty, on the other hand, believes that scurvy was the main cause of early sickness in Virginia; while Blanton has recently ascribed this tragedy to dysentery and to typhoid.[13] Smallpox was not involved in the general fevers, since it was commonly recognized as a distinct disorder.

No doubt typhoid, dysentery, and malaria were all involved, in varying degrees, in the "autumnal fevers" of early settlements; and occasionally dengue or other infectious diseases were present. Respiratory infections certainly constituted the greater part of the "winter fevers"; and scurvy or other malnutrition diseases must have prevailed whenever diets were seriously restricted. Keeping such generalizations in mind, and making allowance for variations in time and place, it is by no means impossible to interpret the early reports on disease. The historian who does interpret them will be rewarded not only by a knowledge of disease history in itself, but by what is of more direct concern to him—new light on social conditions in general. No one can read the endless comments

that the seminar method was introduced in the Boston "Society for Medical Improvement" by Louis's American pupils at this time. This was about a half century before it entered, through German influence, into general historical training in this country.

[11] See, for example, the presidential address of Alexander Coventry, to the New York State Medical Society in 1824 (*Transactions*, I, 257 ff.) in which he recited the tragic history of the fevers in the Seneca Lake country.

[12] See Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, *Virginia under the Stuarts* (Princeton, 1922), p. 115; and the same author's *The First Americans* (New York, 1929), pp. 178 ff.

[13] John J. Heagerty, *Four Centuries of Medical History in Canada* (Toronto, 1928), I, 7 ff.; Wyndham H. Blanton, *Medicine in Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* (Richmond, 1930), pp. 50 ff.

on "fevers" and "fluxes" in new settlements without suspecting that the heroic tradition of the robust frontiersman is a misleading one. The "rugged individualists" of the backwoods were not so rugged after all.

As Garrison and others have pointed out—and indeed as Holmes observed a century ago—the frontier was at first a healthy region. This was the sylvan paradise stage, familiar only to explorers, to fur traders, and to settlers during the first year or so of settlement. Permanent occupation reversed the situation in tragic fashion, since it was attended by a devastating development of the diseases noted. Later, as the frontier-farming stage merged gradually into the humdrum regime of established settlement, the fevers as gradually declined. The rapidity of the process varied widely; such factors as climate, the particular diseases involved, and the distinction between rural and urban conditions all played their part. Yet the general pattern is the same, whether one considers the first settlement at Charleston late in the seventeenth century, the migration into the Genesee country at the end of the eighteenth century, or the late coming of the "forty-niners" to California.[14] One could almost define the different stages of settlement in terms of their dominant diseases, as well as by the characteristics more usually noted. It may be added, in passing, that perhaps the earliest published description of these stages, later elaborated in the Turner thesis, is to be found in the essays of the physician Benjamin Rush.[15]

In the more comprehensive writings of another great physician, Daniel Drake, is evidence of the persistence of frontier types of disease for a considerable period and over large areas. This evidence is assembled in the most impressive of all American works on medical geography—Drake's classic volumes on the diseases of the Mississippi Valley.[16] The author traveled all over the great valley for many years, taking careful notes on its climate, flora, fauna, ethnography, and the prevailing diseases. Garrison is convinced that nothing comparable had appeared since the Hippocratic writings. No work of so comprehensive a character can fail to have some value for the social historian.

The reason for this is obvious enough. The physician who reports disease on a social scale almost necessarily relates it to environment.

[14] St. Julien Ravenel Childs, "Health and Disease in the Early History of South Carolina" (MS. thesis, George Washington University, 1931), pp. 24 ff.; Alexander Coventry, N. Y. State Med. Soc., *Trans.*, I, 257 ff. (1824); E. O. Essig, *A History of Entomology* (New York, 1931), p. 210.

[15] In his papers on Pennsylvania, published in *Essays, Literary, Moral, & Philosophical* (Philadelphia, 1798), pp. 213 ff., 226 ff.

[16] *A Systematic Treatise . . . on the Principal Diseases of the Interior Valley of North America* (Cincinnati, 1850).

The living conditions associated with a given type of illness are likely to possess causal significance, and must be described along with the symptoms. For the same reason, a doctor wishing to eradicate a given endemic condition may find it desirable to investigate and to condemn related social circumstances. So it was that certain physicians became social reformers, and their writings took on something of the character of social surveys.

With the advent of the early industrial revolution in England, for example, physicians were in the van of those who protested against the dangers of overcrowded and unsanitary slums. An early picture of such conditions can be found in the first works on medical police—notably in such a study as Roberton's, which was published in Edinburgh in 1808-1809.[17] Less formal, but quite interesting are the accounts given in the medical essays of private practitioners. One of the best examples is in the "medical histories" of Dr. John Ferriar of Manchester, written late in the eighteenth century.[18] He belonged to the famous "Manchester group" of socially minded physicians which, among other things, did something to start Robert Owen on his career of amelioration. Ferriar was not only able to report on the living conditions of the poor, but he was in a position to do so more intelligently than were most other observers.

This critical point deserves emphasis. The value of medical evidence lies not simply in the fact that it is so much more evidence, but rather in that it may afford the most significant information available. Because of both the intimate and the continuous character of his contacts with the poor, the doctor was more likely to understand their situation than were other local observers who came into casual association with them. In like manner, the doctor was—other things being equal—a more reliable reporter than the traveler who observed only in passing. This means that the medical literature, relatively unknown to social historians, affords at times more trustworthy evidence than does the travel literature so religiously consulted by them.

A striking illustration of this is afforded by the history of that truly "peculiar institution", American Negro slavery. It will be recalled that much of the controversy concerning slavery centered about one obvious and basic question. Were or were not the slaves ill treated? Testimony was taken from planters on the one hand, and from English or Northern travelers on the other. Now the former knew slavery well enough, but were naturally biased by their vested interests therein. Some of the

[17] John Roberton, *Medical Police*, etc.

[18] *Medical Histories and Reflections* (London, 1810–1813), II, 213 ff.

travelers were disqualified as observers by just the opposite bias, for they saw the Southern scene obscurely through the glass of abolitionist sentiment.

Of all critics, the Southern physician was perhaps in the best position to report on the physical and moral treatment of the slaves. When he stated, as he sometimes did, that Negroes were overworked and underfed, he can hardly be suspected of antislavery bias since he was the friend of the planter who employed him. As a matter of fact, he usually approved of the institution. Coming into frequent contact with human bondage under the most intimate circumstances, he was in a position to understand it as few travelers could hope to do. On the other hand, his vested interest in the institution was rarely so direct or so great as was that of the planters.

Yet of all sources, it is this relatively reliable professional testimony which is alone neglected by the historians of slavery. It is a rare treatise, for example, which does not cite Frederick Law Olmsted—a Connecticut Yankee at King Cotton's court, a traveler who, having given up farming at home, devoted several long trips to telling the South how to improve its own agriculture. And it is an equally rare study which cites the medical evidence.

This is not to be explained by any lack of material. The personal comments of physicians in their correspondence is, to be sure, rather inaccessible, since many volumes containing the papers of Southern politicians have been published for every one pertaining to physicians.[19] The evidence is again found chiefly in the medical journals, and in the transactions of medical societies. Some of this related primarily to demography; as did Lemuel Shattuck's important article in the *American Journal of the Medical Sciences,* in which he called attention to an interesting phenomenon, the marked decline of the Negro population in Boston during the eighteenth century.[20]

Writing in the same period, Josiah Nott compared the Negro mortality rates of the chief Eastern seaports during the first half of the nineteenth century. He contrasted the relatively high death rates for free Negroes in Northern cities with the relatively low rates for slaves in the Southern towns. Conscious that the difference here might be ascribed to the influence of climate—since Negroes were supposed to

[19] It may be remarked, incidentally, that there is a real opportunity here to present to the reading public the correspondence or memoirs of a learned profession, in addition to the many collections now available for political leaders. Those who have read the professional memoirs which have occasionally appeared—for example, the autobiography of Marion Sims—will recall how fascinating these can be.

[20] "On the Vital Statistics of Boston", N. S., I, 371, 377 (Philadelphia, 1841).

succumb in direct proportion to their distance from ancestral homes—Nott then compared the two groups within the one border city of Baltimore. He found that here, within the same climatic area, free Negroes still perished more frequently than did their brethren in bondage.[21] The physician therefore implied that emancipation would be followed by increasing Negro mortality—the very consequence which actually followed abolition in 1865. Unfortunately, neither abolitionists nor politicians read the medical journals in the days "before the War".

Less abstract commentaries on Negroes and slavery are found in articles relating to the diseases, the hygiene, and the general care of plantation slaves. The *Southern Medical Reports*—a promising journal in which Sir William Osler was later to discover his "Alabama student"—contained specific criticism of the treatment of slaves amid some general praise of the institution. Thomas Affleck of Mississippi, a lay contributor writing on plantation hygiene, reported that Negro diet was deficient in vegetables, and that the pneumonia common in the cabins in winter was "greatly aggravated by the unskilful treatment of the overseers". His comment on the care of Negro children was in sharp contrast to the pleasant traditions that have come down to us by word of mouth in the better families. The slave quarters "are often badly located", he observed, the "children [are] allowed to be filthy; are suckled hurriedly, whilst the mother is over-heated"; and "a vast proportion die under nine or ten days, from the most unskilful management of negro midwives".[22]

Another somber aspect of slavery was emphasized by Dr. Pendleton, when he noted the frequency of abortion among Negro women. "All country practitioners", he observed, "are aware of the frequent complaints of planters upon this subject." There were four times as many abortions and miscarriages, in proportion to population, among the Negroes as among the whites. The planters were convinced, according to Pendleton, that the slaves resorted to the use of emmenagogues, but he himself was uncertain on this point.[23] It may be that there is material here for a hitherto unrecognized and somewhat bizarre chapter in the history of birth control in the United States.

The probable persistence of malnutrition diseases among Negroes in

[21] "Health and Longevity of the Southern Seaports", *Southern Journal of Medicine and Pharmacy*, II, 138 (Charleston, 1847).

[22] "On the Hygiene of Cotton Plantations and the Management of Negro Slaves", *Southern Med. Repts.*, II, 432 ff. (New Orleans, 1850). The journal appeared only for this and the preceding year.

[23] E. M. Pendleton, "On the Susceptibility of the Caucasian and African Races to the Different Classes of Disease", *ibid.*, I, 338.

the Lower South, long after the days of early settlement, also suggests an unhappy aspect of slave life. The evidence here, like all of that pertaining to the history of disease, is somewhat uncertain and is open to interpretation. It is not absolutely certain that the Negroes suffered from malnutrition—or, if they did, that poor whites did not also suffer in the same degree. It is suggestive, however, that the medical literature reported a serious disease peculiar to Negroes in the West Indies and in the Gulf region in the United States—a disease commonly known, after 1800, by the none too illuminating name of *cachexia africana*. The symptoms were complicated and numerous—including dirt-eating, anemia, edema, melancholy, and heart failure. The progress of the disease was moderately rapid and it was often fatal.

Now that many diseases can be classified on a causal basis, it is easy to see that there was some hookworm infection involved. A study of the earlier French and British literature, as well as the American, leads to the view that serious malnutrition diseases were also present in this typically confused "clinical picture".[24] The relatively rapid and fatal character of the disorder was not typical of hookworm infection; certain symptoms suggest pellagra, and it is also possible that scurvy or beriberi were involved. The distribution of *cachexia africana* coincided with that of large sugar plantations on which Negroes were fed a routine diet of corn bread, salt pork, and molasses; and some physicians reported that the disease was cured by providing a variety of fresh foods. These facts suggest that large gangs of slaves were required, presumably because of the ignorance of their masters, to live upon disease producing diets.

Professional literature sometimes expressed the political as well as the social spirit of the times. This is well illustrated in Samuel A. Cartwright's contribution to the *Southern Medical Reports* on "The Diseases and Physical Peculiarities of the Negro Race". Cartwright advanced the thesis that the main cause of the whole sectional controversy preceding the Civil War was Northern ignorance concerning matters medical and psychological. For, he declared, "the vulgar error that there is no difference in the negro's organization, physiology and psychology,

[24] [J. B.] Dazille, *Observations sur les Maladies des Nègres* (Paris, 1792), I, 342 ff.; Benjamin Rush, "An account of the diseases peculiar to the negroes in the West-Indies, and which are produced by their slavery", *American Museum*, IV, 81 f. (Philadelphia, 1788); John Hunter, *Observations on the Diseases of the Army in Jamaica* (3d ed., London, 1808), pp. 248 ff.; W. M. Carpenter, "Observations on the Cachexia Africana", etc., *New Orleans Medical Journal*, I, 146–168 (1844); F. W. Craigin, "Observations on Cachexia Africana or Dirt-Eating", *Am. Jour. of the Med. Sciences*, XVII, 356 ff. (1836); J. B. Duncan, "On the . . . Diseases of the Parish of St. Mary, La.", *Southern Med. Repts.*, I, 194–195 (1849).

and that all the apparent difference arises from Southern slavery, is the cause of all those political agitations which are threatening to dissolve our Union. The knowledge to correct this most mischievous error", he added, ". . . is to be found by cultivating comparative anatomy, physiology, history and ethnography." Here is stated a scientific rather than an economic or political cause of the Civil War. The essay formed a part of what might be termed the scientific proslavery movement, which has received less attention than the literary movement directed toward the same end.[25]

It has already been observed that medical men were among the first to protest the evils of industrial towns. They were often leaders in the sanitary reform movement which can be traced to the later eighteenth century, but which did not acquire much headway until after 1830. During the next two decades, the major reports on living conditions in industrial slums were prepared by socially minded physicians. Drs. Villermé of Paris, Arnott, Kay, and Smith of London, Griscom of New York, and Virchow of Berlin are perhaps the best examples. Their individual descriptions of living conditions in Paris, in London, in New York, and in Silesia are valuable sources for the social history of the period.[26] But these were transcended by another type of medical literature; namely, the medical survey in which numbers of physicians cooperated to portray the living conditions of a given area, in some cases of an entire nation.

The most important example of this was the famous English Poor Law Board report of 1842, in which a lay sanitarian, Edwin Chadwick, analyzed the local statements submitted by the poor law doctors for every "union" in England. Supplementary data for parts of Scotland were included.[27] Although this report on "the Sanitary Condition of the

[25] *Ibid.*, II, 429. There was quite a body of such literature, including sociological, anthropological, and medical writings. Such authors as Fitzhugh, Hundley, Nott, and Van Evrie are already well known in this connection.

[26] [Louis René] Villermé, "Mémoire sur la mortalité en France dans la classe aisée et dans la classe indigente", *Mém.*, Académie de médecine (Paris, 1828); and the same author's *Tableau de l'état physique et moral des ouvriers employés dans les manufactures de coton, de laine, et de soie* (2 vols., Paris, 1840); N. Arnott and J. P. Kay, "On the Prevalence of Certain Physical Causes of Fever in the Metropolis", in appendix to the *Fourth Annual Report of the Poor Law Commissioners* (London, 1838); Southwood Smith, "Report on some of the Physical Causes of Sickness and Mortality", etc., *ibid.*; John H. Griscom, *The Sanitary Condition of the Laboring Population of New York* (New York, 1845); Rudolf Virchow, "Mittheilungen über die in Oberschlesienherrschende Typhus-Epidemie", *Archiv für pathologische Anatomie* (Berlin, 1848).

[27] *Report . . . on an Enquiry into the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great Britain, with Appendices* (London, 1842).

Labouring Population" was in origin an investigation of the poor law medical system, it afforded in fact a picture of the living conditions of the poorer urban classes throughout Great Britain. None of the other social investigations of the period, such as the studies made in the mines and in the factories, compared with it in scope. If one really wishes to know how the urban masses lived in early Victorian England, this great medical survey is the place *par excellence* in which to find that information.

Similar investigations could hardly be made by physicians in the United States, where there was no Federal medical system. The National Institute of Washington attempted for some years to arrange for a survey, and finally persuaded the American Medical Association to undertake a study of urban conditions. The reports returned by that organization's committee on hygiene, in 1848 and in 1849, contain some of the first critical descriptions of slum conditions in growing American cities.[28] Meanwhile, Lemuel Shattuck directed and drafted (1850) a famous sanitary survey of Massachusetts which threw considerable light on living conditions in that region.[29] No other state, however, was sufficiently progressive to provide for a similar study; and when Dr. John Shaw Billings revived in 1880 the plan for a great national survey, it was defeated by general indifference.[30] Had this study ever been made, it would have afforded a cross-section view of American living conditions comparable to that of English life provided in the *Report* of 1842.

Special surveys, fortunately, comprised but a small part of the literature relating to the public health. As permanent health departments were established in progressive countries—first local or provincial bodies, later national offices as well—they issued regular reports which included no little material of social significance. Historians owe a considerable debt to cholera, in this connection, for it was largely fear of this disease which prompted the organization and publications of health departments between 1830 and 1880. Anyone interested in the public health movement per se, naturally must use these official documents; and they have been consulted occasionally by general historians. It is only to be mentioned, in passing, that the American literature includes materials dating as early as the eighteenth century, and that some quite extensive

[28] See the Am. Med. Assoc., *Transactions*, I, 305 ff.; II, 431 ff. (Philadelphia, 1848, 1849).

[29] *Report on the Sanitary Condition of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1850).

[30] Fielding H. Garrison, "Geomedicine: a Science in Gestation", *Bulletin* of the Institute of the History of Medicine, vol. I, no. 1, p. 5 (Suppl. to the *Bulletin* of the Johns Hopkins Hospital, vol. LII, no. 1 (Baltimore, January, 1933).

publications are available—such as the proceedings of the important national sanitary conventions of 1857-1860, and the *Papers* and *Journal* of the American Public Health Association. General histories of the public health have been prepared for certain European nations, of which the most notable is Fischer's recent work on Germany.[31] No such study has been made for the United States, but a number of able works relating to the history of special regions or to special phases of the American story have appeared in recent decades.[32]

Works on personal hygiene, as well as on public hygiene, reveal the habits of a people. This is true of the older histories of health, and books on hygiene proper. The first of these histories, in English, is probably that of James Mackenzie (1758);[33] but far more valuable is the encyclopedic work of Sir John Sinclair, published at Edinburgh in 1807.[34] The later work contains, among much other matter, a bibliography listing nearly nineteen hundred items, and an interesting section on the development of sports and games which has much the character of a source for eighteenth century Britain. To one who does not share the prevailing mania for golf, it is quite encouraging to find therein a lament that the grand old game of Scotland went into a decline during that period. The implication that a similar fate may befall it in twentieth century America is most encouraging.

Less obvious is another type of literature which is medical in a broad sense of the term. The popular health papers and journals were often ephemeral as individual publications, but were most persistent as a type in this country from about 1830 to the present time. Some are largely

[31] Alfons Fischer, *Geschichte des deutschen Gesundheitswesens* (2 vols., Berlin, 1933). Note also Sir John Simon, *English Sanitary Institutions* (London, 1890); and Sir Malcolm Morris, *The Story of English Public Health* (London, 1919). Sir Arthur Newsholme's *International Studies* (London and Baltimore, 1931) and his work, in collaboration with John Adams Kingsbury, entitled *Red Medicine: Socialized Health in Soviet Russia* (New York, 1933), afford detailed information on recent history throughout Europe.

[32] References are given in the author's "Origins of the Public Health Movement in the United States", *Annals of Medical History*, N. S., I, 654 ff. (Philadelphia, 1929). The most valuable local history is William Travis Howard, *Public Health Administration and the Natural History of Disease in Baltimore, Maryland, 1797–1920* (Washington, 1924). Probably the best state history is that of Massachusetts, given in George Chandler Whipple, *State Sanitation* (Cambridge, 1917). An outstanding study of Federal health work is Robert D. Leigh's, *Federal Health Administration in the United States* (New York, 1927), which includes much historical material. Mazÿck P. Ravenel, ed., *A Half Century of Public Health* (New York, 1921), contains short historical articles which afford the most comprehensive picture of later American developments.

[33] *The History of Health and the Art of Preserving It* (Edinburgh).

[34] *Code of Health and Longevity* (4 vols., Edinburgh).

worthless, but others—such as the Grahamite papers—at least afford interesting side lights on the habits and customs of their time, from bathing to birth control.[35]

It is generally recognized, finally, that the history of the medical profession itself represents a significant phase of social and cultural evolution. Excellent work has been done by medical historians, as by Packard and recently by Sigerist,[36] in tracing the American story; but the subject is a complicated one, and probably merits further study. It includes such phases as the history of professional training and licensing, the related difficulties with quackery and sectarianism, the development of professional ethics, and the now much mooted question of the organization and economics of medical practice.[37] The single topic of the relation of American medicine to the European, affording as it does a specific illustration of the transition of culture across the Atlantic, is worthy of the most careful investigation.

On all these matters, the publications of nearly every local and state medical society, to say nothing of individual essays and regular journals, contain a vast amount of pertinent material. This is not at all technical in character, and occasionally approaches the level of genuine literature. There are few more enlightening essays on the status of American culture, for example, than the reports on American medical literature submitted to the American Medical Association between 1848 and 1852. These essays seem to be little known, apparently because they remain buried in the *Transactions* of the association. It was here that Holmes, voicing that same interest in a national culture which animated Emerson and other contemporaries, deplored the continued colonial dependence of medical authors upon British publications. Most native writers, he declared, were simply putting "English portraits of disease in American frames".[38]

[35] *E.g.*, the Boston *Health Journal and Advocate of Physiological Reform* (1840); the New York *Herald of Health*, which had a long run in that city after *ca.* 1850.

[36] Francis R. Packard, *History of Medicine in the United States* (2d ed., 2 vols., New York, 1931); Henry E. Sigerist, *Amerika und die Medizin* (Leipzig, 1933); and the same work, translated by Hildegard Nagel under the title *American Medicine* (New York, 1934).

[37] It may be observed that the final report of the "Committee on the Costs of Medical Care" (*Medical Care for the American People*, Chicago, 1932) contains data which will probably prove of great value to the future historian. Dr. Harry H. Moore, who served as director of this study, also contributed a section on "Health and Medical Practice" to President Hoover's report on *Recent Social Trends* (New York, 1933), II, 1061 ff., which will probably have a similar value.

[38] Am. Med. Assoc., *Trans.*, I, 283–288 (Philadelphia, 1848). I am assuming here that Holmes wrote this report, since he was chairman of the committee on medical literature which submitted it that year. The style also would suggest his authorship.

Even the most technical medical literature is occasionally of some general interest. It may directly reflect the whole intellectual tone of a given period, as does the speculative German work of the *naturphilosophie* era early in the nineteenth century. Or, again, the introductory sections of a technical work may prove suggestive, when the remainder of its pages are quite barren for the general reader. Thus an introductory letter, in a work by Dr. Charles D. Meigs, contains a typically Victorian tribute to the "genteel female" which should prove of passing interest to the historian of feminism. The good doctor solemnly assures his students that woman's "intellectual force is different from that of her master and lord"; and after much more to the same effect, concludes that her place is in the home "except when, like the star of day, she deigns to issue forth to the world, to exhibit her beauty and her grace".[39] All this sweetness and light went to make up a lecture on obstetrics. It would be difficult to find anything sweeter—or lighter, for that matter—in the hearts and flowers literature of the period.

Here and there throughout his pages, Meigs refers to his patients as "the dear little ladies"—a phrase which now appears somewhat incongruous in such a setting. The Victorians could practice a sort of brutal realism, however, for all their sentiment. It was this same influential physician who denied his "dear ladies" the benefit of aseptic procedures, when these were first advocated by the critical Dr. Holmes. The resulting controversy between the Boston anatomist and the Philadelphia obstetrician was one of the most dramatic in the history of American medicine.

It would be easy, it may be observed in conclusion, to exaggerate the value of medical sources in general historiography. The greatest part of this literature is naturally of interest only to medical men. But this affords no reason for overlooking the pertinent material which is there. The necessity for working through many irrelevant pages is by no means peculiar to the use of professional literature. It is the typical experience, as many a distracted searcher knows, of those who struggle through newspaper files. And here one distinct advantage inheres in the use of medical sources. Probably no other materials can be so easily checked and located. We owe this largely to the development of American library technique and bibliographical organization.

Until almost 1880, physicians had available only catalogues for special subjects or for individual authors. But about that year, the U. S. A.

[39] "Sexual Peculiarities" (Letter IV), in *Females and Their Diseases* (Philadelphia, 1848), pp. 40 ff.

Surgeon General's Library began to issue the *Index Medicus* of current publications, and also the first series of its great *Index Catalogue*. The first edition of the latter was completed in 1895, a second in 1916, a third in 1933, and a fourth is under way. No less than forty-eight large volumes have been published to date. The presiding genius in the original preparation of this work was John Shaw Billings, a versatile physician who later became the first director of the New York Public Library.[40] He was ably assisted by Robert Fletcher and by Fielding H. Garrison. Today, the Surgeon General's Library contains nearly a million volumes and probably constitutes the greatest medical library in existence. In the *Catalogue*, a standard reference work the world over, the historian will find the most specific subject as well as author headings, and under each of these both books and a select list of periodical items in all European languages. A considerable percentage of the more important materials listed here will also be found in other large medical libraries.

The facilities thus afforded for checking medical sources make their use seem relatively simple and final in comparison with the exploitation of ordinary newspapers or correspondence. There have always been individual historians, of course, who used medical materials; and a number of American historians have recently made more general use of these sources.[41] Yet it is still true, that there is no other great corpus of literature which is so little employed by scholars at large.[42] The *Index Catalogue* itself is not mentioned in excellent manuals of historical bibliography, which list with great care practically all other guides available.

It is a fair prediction that once historians become familiar with the great bibliographical tool which Billings developed they will consult the medical sources more frequently and more systematically. The historical needle in the medical haystack is not so hard to find after all, and is sometimes well worth the searching.

Richard H. Shryock.

Duke University.

[40] See Walter F. Willcox, "John Shaw Billings", *Dict. Am. Biog.*, II, 266 ff.; and, for the full account, Fielding H. Garrison, *John Shaw Billings: a Memoir* (New York, 1915).

[41] Notably Lynn Thorndike and other medievalists interested in the history of European science. A recognition of the value of medical sources for American social history will be found in several of the volumes of the History of American Life series, edited by Dixon R. Fox and Arthur M. Schlesinger. Examples of the intensive use of medical materials are afforded in such recent American biographies as Nathan G. Goodman, *Benjamin Rush* (Philadelphia, 1934); and Courtney Robert Hall, *A Scientist in the Early Republic, Samuel Lotham Mitchill, 1764–1831* (New York, 1934).

[42] Unless it is the legal literature. This is another story.

THE AUSTRO-FRENCH COMMERCIAL TREATY OF 1866

An important change in Austrian commercial policy occurred in the decade of the sixties of the nineteenth century. During the first half of the century the Hapsburg monarchy clung to the ideal of a closed commercial state as an essential means of strengthening and preserving its heterogeneous empire. The varied production of its territories and its location apart from northwestern Europe supported this policy. Thus while many other states of Europe were beginning to experience the industrial revolution and were responding to new theories of international trade, Austria remained backward in industrial development and isolated commercially.

Austria's first recognition of the inadequacy of this policy came when her leadership in Germany was threatened by the growth of Prussia's power, particularly through the development of the Zollverein. During the years of struggle to secure participation in such a tariff union, especially under the leadership of Bruck, the great liberal minister of commerce, a definite change toward a more liberal policy had begun. But commercial policy played a subordinate part in that drama. Political aims were the determining factors, no matter how these might have been concealed at any particular time. The definite exclusion of Austria from a German tariff union in 1865 brought her rather abruptly to a realization of her unenviable situation in regard to commercial relations with other nations, and it is then that we find a commercial policy developing which was dictated primarily by the economic rather than the political needs of the state. Two of the major points were the liberal reform of the tariff and the establishment of closer relations with other nations by means of treaties of commerce. The system of prohibitions, relinquished in principle in a reform undertaken in 1851, but still effective in practice, was to be abandoned and commercial treaties were to be concluded with other nations, with the hope of stimulating Austrian agriculture and industry.

The decisive step was the treaty concluded with France on December 11, 1866. Its significance is due to its effectiveness as an instrument of the new tariff policy and the important part it played in the acceleration of the industrial revolution and stimulation of economic progress within Austria rather than to the extent of commercial intercourse which followed between the two nations. It was the first treaty with a West European power outside of Germany to contain a tariff, and this pro-

vided for marked reduction in a number of duties. Further, it contained a most-favored-nation clause enabling both nations to share in tariff reductions which either might grant in future to other nations. Thus it was a factor in the general lowering of tariff walls and increased interaction of economic forces which marked the era of the sixties and early seventies in Western Europe.

Prior to 1866 no treaty of commerce existed between France and Austria. The limited trade between the two nations was carried on mainly via the Mediterranean. Some early negotiations between the two countries in the forties concerned water-borne trade, but these had no substantial results.[1] Following the important Anglo-French commercial treaty of 1860, France made overtures to Austria concerning a similar agreement. But Austria felt that such a treaty would seriously weaken her position in opposing the most-favored-nation treaty being negotiated by France and Prussia, and the proposal was allowed to drop. When that treaty became a reality, Vienna sought to secure modification of the objectionable most-favored-nation clause through direct negotiation with France, but in vain.

The acceptance of the French treaty by the German states and the renewal of the Zollverein produced a situation which rendered action by Austria imperative. The new conventional tariffs plus the most-favored-nation principle resulted in a widespread lowering of tariff walls. This left Austria, which had no such treaty except with the Zollverein, at a disadvantage and threatened her with economic isolation. Therefore in pursuance of the principle of tariff reform by means of commercial treaties, adopted in the fall of 1864, the government determined on a unified plan "which would include treaties with England and France prior to the adoption of a new general tariff".[2] Such a plan,

[1] Projet d'un Mémoire addresser par le Cabinet impérial de Vienne au Gouvernement français . . . [1850], Archiv des Innern, Justiz, und Handels, 671/HM, 1851. (This repository will be referred to hereafter as Arch. I. J. H., with document references following.) In a Note pour le Ministre, Dec. 28, 1854 (Archives des Affaires étrangères, Direction commerciale, série C, carton 3A, dossier 4), there is mention of overtures made by Vienna in the last years of Louis Philippe's reign. In the early fifties an attempt at negotiations failed due to Austria's suspicion of French designs to forestall a German economic union. Buol to Bourgueney, July 31, 1853, and May 29, 1854, *ibid.*

[2] Promemoria, May 27, 1865, Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv, F5/V 3. "It would be useless to deny", states the Promemoria, "that after the step taken by Prussia entrance into the system of commercial treaties of the Western powers has become a necessity for Austria, and can contribute substantially to the preservation of peace". Hock, Austrian tariff expert, pointed out that Austria should use tariff reductions, which were inevitable, to secure for her industry advantages in France which other states already enjoyed. Adolf Beer, *Österreichische Handelspolitik im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 1891), pp. 268–269.

of course, could not solve all of Austria's economic difficulties. She lacked both a well-planned scheme of economic development and a firm commercial policy, and had failed to keep pace with the new economic growth of Europe. Now, as the government endeavored to make its new policy effective, it was constantly hampered by conditions that were the direct result of its earlier failure to recognize the soundness and necessity of economic reforms. It was essential, therefore, that many other liberal changes go hand in hand with tariff reform.

In October, 1864, both France and Austria expressed the desire to negotiate a commercial treaty, but nothing could be done until the new treaty between Austria and the Zollverein had been concluded. This was signed in April, 1865.[3] In September an event happened which smoothed the way for the Austrian government. The principal minister, Belcredi, to carry out a scheme of federalization, issued the Manifesto of September 20, which suspended the constitution, but left to the government the power to handle all urgent matters, especially those involving the financial and commercial interests of the empire.[4] One important consequence was that it was no longer necessary to secure the approval of treaties of commerce by the strongly protectionist Reichsrath; these would be ratified by action of the council of ministers and the decree of the emperor.[5] Inasmuch as it was the government rather than parliament which was the force behind the new commercial policy, the significance of this change which left the government unhampered by parliamentary delay and denial will be appreciated.

The first announcements of the new government clearly indicated the liberal character of its commercial policy. The financial needs of the state had much to do with it, for as usual, Austria needed credit.[6]

[3] The draft of a new general tariff was laid before the Reichsrath in April, 1865. It was to take effect on January 1, 1866, in respect to all nations equally except those refusing to grant most-favored-nation treatment, against whom an additional levy of forty per cent might be made. Because of insufficient time for debate, a temporary tariff was passed maintaining the differential system. As a result both England and France were anxious for most-favored-nation agreements.

[4] London *Times*, Sept. 22, 1865, p. 10. The Reichsrath did not meet again until May 20, 1867, after the conclusion of the *Ausgleich* between Austria and Hungary.

[5] Treaties with England, France, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, and Liberia were concluded under this regime. It is interesting to note that in France also it was the power of the emperor to conclude treaties of commerce without the approval of the Chambers which made it possible for him to carry out his plan for a series of such treaties. Arthur Louis Dunham, *The Anglo-French Treaty of Commerce of 1860* (Ann Arbor, 1930), pp. 42–43.

[6] Approximately $43,000,000 was required to meet payments due the National Bank; not a large sum in itself, but in view of constant deficits and the weight of the national debt it represented a great additional burden. See London *Times*, July 4, 1865, p. 12.

In July, 1865, negotiations for loans had been begun with English capitalists, but the Austrian government soon realized that there was little hope of securing loans in either London or Paris if it did not turn from the old protective system which had become so distasteful to Western Europe, and open her markets to trade. But economic interests were by no means the only determining factors. The desire to improve foreign relations was of influence. In view of her differences with Prussia over the Schleswig-Holstein question, it was highly desirable to improve relations with England and France through treaties of commerce.

Two men in the Belcredi ministry played important roles in making the new policy effective. One was Count Larisch, minister of finance, who was intimately concerned with the tariff from that standpoint and worked in close co-operation with the minister of commerce in the treaty negotiations. The other was Baron von Wüllerstorf, minister of commerce.

The task of finding a suitable head for the ministry of commerce had been difficult. Since Bruck's able administration in the early fifties this department had been little more than an adjunct of the ministries of foreign affairs and finance, with neither power in affairs of state nor unity within itself. The prestige of the office had sunk so low that one after another of those asked to assume the post gave their excuses.[7] Finally, however, the position, the potential responsibilities and opportunities of which were indeed great, was accepted by Admiral von Wüllerstorf, whose administrative capacity and broad views had already won recognition.[8] Observations during travels in Western Europe of the benefits which followed increased freedom of commercial intercourse had strengthened his conviction that a liberal commercial policy was essential to the economic development of Austria. She too must lower trade barriers and broaden her contacts with the rest of the world, or suffer in ever-increasing degree the results of her isolation.[9] He was in

[7] The office was refused by Schwarz, director of the Austrian consulate at Paris, by Baron Hübner, who according to the *Times* "cannot possibly know anything about commercial matters", and by Von Schœffer, director of the Austrian consulate in London. London *Times,* July 8, 22, p. 10; Aug. 2, 5, 16, p. 10; and Sept. 13, 1865, p. 10.

[8] While perhaps lacking in commercial experience, he was "as well versed in commercial matters as a theorist can possibly be". He had shown his administrative ability in reorganizing the naval department at Trieste and in his capacity as director of the Naval Academy there. In 1857–1858 he was in command of the 'Novara' Expedition which circled the globe in the interests of natural science and of Austria's foreign trade. London *Times,* Oct. 11, 1865.

[9] The keynote of his policy was given in an address soon after he assumed office on Sept. 30, 1865. "It is necessary for Austria", he said, "that all commerce should be free,

full agreement with the plan for commercial treaties, and furthermore was determined that the ministry of commerce should take the lead in their negotiation.

The ministry of foreign affairs was already involved in unofficial negotiations with the English, who were persistent in their attempt to secure most-favored-nation treatment together with special reductions on textiles. The treaty with England, concluded on December 16, 1865, was essentially such an agreement. Austria set the maximum of twenty-five per cent ad valorem for duties on English goods from January 1, 1867, and twenty per cent from January 1, 1870. A supplementary convention was to be negotiated after the conclusion of the treaty with France and the establishment of a new general tariff. There was no effort to include a schedule of specific duties, since the French treaty would contain this and England would receive automatically the benefits of any reduction.[10] Thus negotiations with France assumed greater significance, for the tariff incorporated in the new treaty would affect directly all nations concluding most-favored-nation agreements with either France or Austria.

It was coincident with the successful conclusion of loan operations in Paris that Austria informed the French government that she was ready to begin active negotiations.[11] These negotiations fall into two parts divided by the crisis of July and August, 1866, when Austria and Prussia were at war. Preliminary discussions were begun in Paris, therefore, but since these were handled by the foreign office rather than

and that labour should receive a better remuneration. All obstacles which oppose the free development of material interests ought, therefore, to be removed." London *Times*, Oct. 11, 1865, p. 10. It is important to note that Wüllerstorf laid emphasis on the necessity of broad reform in regard to general domestic business life as well as in commercial relations with foreign nations. See his *Vermischte Schriften* (Graz, 1889) for his ideas on economic affairs.

[10] Only two specific duties were fixed, the Austrian export duty on rags and the import duty on salted herring. Léopold Neumann and Adolphe de Plason, *Recueil des traités et conventions conclus par l'Autriche avec les puissances étrangères, depuis 1763 jusqu'à nos jours* (Vienna, 1877), N. S., vol. IV, no. 328.

[11] Telegram, Mensdorff to Metternich, Nov. 12, 1865, Staatsarchiv, F5/V 21. Alexander von Matlekovits (*Die Zollpolitik der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie vom Jahre 1850 bis zur Gegenwart*, Budapest, 1877, p. 103) states that the treaty with France was made partly on political grounds and partly because France had supported Austrian credit operations more than England. Too much emphasis should not be placed on the desire for financial aid as an actual cause of the treaty with France. While there are frequent references to loans and the effect of negotiations for a commercial treaty on such operations in the documents concerning England, they are conspicuously absent from records of the French negotiations. Plans for a treaty with France had been made before loan operations began, and for other reasons, as we have seen.

by the ministry of commerce, the latter could deal with the important matter only at second hand. The determination of Wüllerstorf to give his department independence and power commensurate with its responsibilities is seen in the request that his first assistant, Pretis, be delegated to assist Schwarz, in charge of the preliminary negotiations for the foreign office, and eventually replace him.[12]

Austria's position in the negotiation of commercial treaties was made exceedingly difficult by the deplorable lack of information concerning her own economic condition. No adequate study of the tariff question had been made, and one of Wüllerstorf's first acts was to secure a joint commission of the departments of commerce and finance to do this very essential work. It had been planned to use the temporary tariff as the basis of negotiations with France and England. But it held, in general, to the old duties and both states had demanded reductions far greater than had ever been considered possible.[13] Between these demands on the one hand and the pressure of domestic industrial interests and the financial needs of the state on the other, the proper course was often most difficult to determine and delay was inevitable.

At the first of the preliminary discussions the French offered most-favored-nation treatment on the basis of full reciprocity, and presented proposals for five treaties and conventions which they hoped to negotiate: (1) a treaty of commerce; (2) a treaty of navigation; (3) a convention on copyrights; (4) a railway convention;[14] and (5) a convention concerning the settlement of estates through consular offices. The Austrian representatives in turn presented the draft of the new tariff as a basis for the negotiations and declared that her duties would not exceed twenty-five per cent ad valorem.[15] The results of these preliminary conversations were formulated in two official preparatory conferences on the 20th

[12] Of especial significance is the final paragraph of the letter: "While I await your Excellency's further pleasure I feel compelled in closing to voice my conviction that since His Majesty the Emperor has been moved to appoint a minister of commerce, treaties must henceforth fall completely within the province of the ministry of commerce, whose effectiveness without this agendum, which strikes so deeply in the economic life of the empire, would be impaired very decidedly." Wüllerstorf to Mensdorff, Oct. 19, 1865, Archiv des Finanzministeriums, ad 4673/FM, 1866.

[13] Promemoria zur Zoll- und Handelsfrage, minister of foreign affairs to minister of commerce, Oct. 2, 1865, Staatsarchiv, F5/V 4.

[14] The railway convention was not in the list of agreements finally ratified, but one on consular offices was added.

[15] This was the tariff which the Reichsrath had been unable to pass before its dissolution in July, and which the government wished to use as the basis of all its new treaty tariffs. Schwarz to Metternich, Nov. 21, 1865, Staatsarchiv, F5/V 25.

and 22d of December.[16] Negotiations then were adjourned to give both governments opportunity to study the draft agreements, which in their final form were to constitute a complete commercial code.

Wüllerstorf had become increasingly impatient over the desultory handling of the preliminary discussions by the foreign office. The protectionists were showing greater strength and he saw that if they were given time they would arouse the chambers of commerce to opposition which might prove fatal to the program of the government.[17] Both he and Pretis became convinced that the best means of speeding the work and arriving at sound decisions as to the Austrian position on questions remaining unsettled at the conferences was the creation of a commission within their own ministry, with representatives from the ministries of foreign affairs and finance, to make necessary studies and correlate views. Such a commission was formed in February, with Pretis in active charge.[18] Unofficial organizations, notably the chambers of commerce, industry, and agriculture, were asked to name advisers, but permission to sit with the commission was denied.[19] In spite of the good work of this body, however, delays were frequent because necessary facts and figures so often were not at hand. Metternich wrote one of his characteristic letters to Mensdorff describing in no uncertain terms the bad effect produced in France by the inaction, and was assured that the tariff commission would complete its work by the end of March, when negotiations would be continued.[20] In due time the commission submitted to the

[16] France requested lower duties on numerous articles and suggested that ad valorem duties on textiles would obviate the inconveniences of the Austrian specific duties. Austria also had a list of items on which she wished reductions, among which steel goods and glassware were of particular importance. Considerable discussion of the question of duties on sugar and distilled spirits brought no agreement and these were reserved for later negotiations.

There were eleven sessions of the preparatory conferences held in Paris from Dec. 20, 1865, to Nov. 13, 1866. See Staatsarchiv, F5/V 54 and Arch. Aff. Étr., Dir. Commer., C-3B-2 for minutes. The final sessions were held at Vienna between Nov. 20 and the signing of the treaty on Dec. 11, 1866. See Staatsarchiv, F5/V 54 for minutes.

[17] The chambers of commerce had considerable influence in Austrian economic affairs. A regulation of 1850 gave them a uniform organization throughout the empire. They served commerce and industry within distinct limits of territory, and presented their views to the minister of commerce to aid him in developing industry and trade. Each made an annual report to the government in March.

[18] The commission was approved by the emperor on Feb. 14, 1866. Wüllerstorf to Francis Joseph, Feb. 11, 1866, Arch. I. J. H., 294/HM, 1866.

[19] Wüllerstorf did not wish to give any interests occasion to complain that they were given no hearing, but carefully guarded against disruption of the government's program. Mensdorff to Wüllerstorf, Feb. 11, 1866, *ibid.*, 253/HM, 1866.

[20] Metternich to Mensdorff, Mar. 7, 1866, and Mensdorff to Metternich, Mar. 12, 1866, Staatsarchiv, F5/V 30a, no. F9, and 30b.

ministers of finance and commerce a set of proposals based on negotiations thus far, and the Paris conferences were resumed.[21]

One of the most important questions to Austria was that of duties on steel. Because of antiquated methods, very inadequate means of transport, and unfavorable economic conditions in general, the cost of production of steel was relatively high, although the quality was excellent. The extensive scythe and sickle industry, which had a large trade with France, suffered greatly because of the advantage given German producers by the treaty between France and the Zollverein.[22] One of Austria's first and most insistent requests, therefore, had been for reductions on steel. The French commissioners contended that assurances given to the French metal industry at the time of the English treaty of 1860 would not allow of such action. But Vienna declared that substantial reductions were an essential point of the treaty and persisted in her demands with such force that in March, 1866, Gramont, the French ambassador, urged his government to lower the duties, adding that Paulin Talabot, an authority on such matters, had assured him that the French steel industry did not require such duties, which were nearly prohibitive.[23]

Another demand stressed by Austria was for reciprocity in indirect trade, a concession which Austria had endeavored to secure in the early fifties but without success. Under the existing French law, this trade was largely reserved for French shipping through the imposition of surtaxes. In spite of this, Austrian ships had built up a considerable carrying trade between the Levant and France. This indirect trade had become an important part of her commerce, capable of considerable expansion if the taxes on it were reduced. She contended that under the principle of reciprocity France should grant this trade the same treat-

[21] France desired that Vienna subscribe to the Sugar Convention of 1864 between France, Great Britain, Belgium, and the Netherlands which established the bases of the drawback on exported refined sugar, so that she could market refined sugar in Austria, but the latter, finding no advantage in such a step, refused. See Larisch to Wüllerstorf, Jan. 14, 1866, *ibid.*, V 54, for an exposition of the sugar problem. There was considerable discussion also over duties on spirits. It was really a question as to whether the customs duty and excise should be combined, as in Austria, or levied separately, as in France. In the final conferences at Vienna Austria agreed to the French method.

[22] Under the latter Zollverein producers paid 144 francs per 100 kgs. less duty than did those of Austria. *Sitzungsberichte der Handels- und Gewerbe-Kammer für Österreich unter der Enns* (Vienna, 1871), session of Oct. 11, 1865.

[23] Gramont to Herbet, Mar. 27, 1866, Arch. Aff. Étr., Dir. Commer., C-3B-1 and 2; also minister of foreign affairs to minister of commerce, Apr. 4, 1865, Archives nationales, F12-6471. Paulin Talabot was a noted French engineer. He was head of the Lyon-Méditerranée railroad system and a member of the Corps législatif.

ment that French ships received.[24] The whole question was suddenly given the prospect of a satisfactory solution by the announcement of the French government in November, 1865, that already a new navigation law abolishing all special taxes on foreign ships had been laid before the Corps législatif and its passage would accord Austria the benefits she desired.[25]

Although agreement had been reached on a number of points at issue, much remained to be done before the commercial code could be completed. In addition to the difficulties already mentioned, the critical political situation which Austria faced in the spring of 1866 affected practically every phase of government activity, causing constant hesitation and uncertainty. "They are working seriously on the treaty of commerce", wrote Gramont, "but truly it must be admitted that Austria has no good fortune and that the circumstances are not propitious for carrying out, with the necessary calm and perseverance, a political, an administrative, a financial, and a commercial reform all at the same moment".[26] Furthermore, the crisis in her relations with Prussia constantly grew more acute, until in June she faced her old rival once again on the issue of the hegemony in Germany. Under such conditions commercial affairs were quickly lost sight of. In May the negotiations with France were postponed until the return of more favorable conditions; not, however, until a memorandum had been dispatched to Paris in response to the French request for the proposals of Austria on unsettled questions, so that these could be studied during the delay occasioned by the Austro-Prussian crisis.[27]

At the end of September France deemed the political situation in the monarchy sufficiently settled to submit a *note verbale* in reply. In this communication she plainly showed her dissatisfaction with the results of the Paris conferences and in the interests of a speedy conclusion of the treaty urged Vienna to send a commissioner to Paris empowered to make definite decisions in regard to all but the most important points. Gramont, in transmitting this note to the Austrian government, suggested that Pretis would be very acceptable in this position, and urged all possible speed. The note itself disclosed few changes in the position

[24] France refused, holding that the most-favored-nation treatment was compensated by the freedom from tonnage tax enjoyed by Austrian ships at Marseilles, together with trading privileges in Algeria.

[25] Promemoria to the minister of foreign affairs, Nov. 24, 1865, Staatsarchiv, F5/V 54.

[26] "The progress of our negotiations", added Gramont, "reminds me a little of the libretto of the ballet in which one sees constantly: 'Three steps forward—three steps backwards—posture erect.'" Gramont to Herbet, Apr. 13, 1866, Arch. Aff. Étr., Dir. Commer., C-3B-1.

[27] Arch. I. J. H., 736/HM, May 21, 1866; Arch. Nat., F12-6471.

of France. It was quite evident that she was awaiting the coming conferences in the hope that opportune concessions might lead Austria to prompt and definitive action.[28]

Vienna willingly acceded to the French request for a special commissioner, and that same month Pretis took up the work at Paris.[29] It is interesting to note that he himself drafted his official instructions, which allowed him considerable scope in the adjustment of matters in dispute.[30] The preliminary conferences were resumed on October 29 and concluded on November 13, 1866. Pretis quickly satisfied French demands for reductions on a number of items and France in turn granted lower duties on a number of Austrian specialties.[31]

Because of the growing network of most-favored-nation agreements, the question of tariff rates involved not merely the immediate negotiators but their relations with other states as well. In view of this, France was particularly concerned with the settlement of the controversy over the steel tariff. Reductions in the duties on Austrian steel meant reductions for English, Belgian, and Italian steel also.[32] French ironmasters had vigorously opposed the new iron and steel duties of the Treaty of 1860 with England. To placate them, the emperor had given assurance of the stability of these duties during the life of the treaty; therefore it was a question whether the reductions which Austria desired could be made without arousing too much opposition and invoking the charge of bad faith against the government.[33]

Charles Combes, French inspector general of mines, was asked to

[28] Staatsarchiv, F5/V 33c. The proposals in regard to various items which were submitted by Austria are taken up and answered in this note. See also Gramont to Wüllerstorf, Sept. 29, 1866, Arch. I. J. H., 1526/HM, 1866.

[29] "The iron is hot and the moment to strike has come", Gramont wrote Herbet on Oct. 7. "Pretis is the right arm of the minister, his *alter ego*. You can talk to him as though he were the minister himself. He is, moreover, an active, capable, and very intelligent man, without prejudice and liberal in his ideas." Arch. Aff. Étr., Dir. Commer., C-3B-1.

[30] The original draft of the official instructions, signed by Wüllerstorf, is in Arch. I. J. H., 1571/HM, 1866, Wüllerstorf to Pretis, Oct. 13, 1866.

[31] Austria's decision to lower the duty on spirits and to grant an optional duty of ten per cent ad valorem on glassware in lieu of specific duties cleared away two points of difficulty. She also agreed to the Zollverein tariff on soap, which France desired. France agreed to leave the reduction of the Austrian duty on olive oil to the negotiations between Austria and Italy, since Vienna wished to use the reduction in bargaining for concessions from her southern neighbor. Preparatory conferences, 4th sess., Paris, Oct. 29, 1866, Staatsarchiv, F5/V 54.

[32] These states had concluded most-favored-nation treaties with France.

[33] Combes to Ozenne, director of foreign trade in the ministry of commerce, Oct. 16, 1866, Arch. Nat., F12-6471.

investigate the matter, and his findings are of interest. During the negotiations of the Anglo-French Treaty of 1860 he had shown that the steel tariff asked for by the French manufacturers was far higher than the extra cost of production justified. The tariff adopted was a compromise, and Combes declared that the growing prosperity of large steel plants in France since the treaty became effective showed that the duties were too high rather than too low.[34] Improvements in production had diminished the spread between the costs in England and France, and the latter was depending less and less on the former for her supply. The existing tariffs, he concluded, were not necessary to safeguard the French metallurgical industry, while they were distinctly prejudicial to the construction industry in general and to the railroads in particular. No disinterested person acquainted with the facts would counsel their establishment, if they did not exist. His testimony was so convincing that the French government forthwith offered Austria the scale of duties suggested by him, and these were accepted without further discussion.[35] Thus Austria won an important concession for her iron and steel industry, and at the same time these reductions were passed on to England, Belgium, and Italy.

Reductions in duties on the finer grades of textiles were much desired by France, and Pretis was able to offer satisfactory concessions in regard to cotton, woolen, and linen goods.[36] But on silk goods no agreement could be reached in the preparatory conferences. As Vienna had done in the question of steel, so Paris did in insisting on a substantial modification of silk duties as an essential point of the treaty. The Austrian tariff commission had recommended a reduction for finest silks from the 1250 francs per 100 kg. of the general tariff to 750 francs, this duty to be reduced further to 600 francs in case that seemed necessary to satisfy France.

[34] In 1860 Combes testified that the difference in cost of production of steel bars between Sheffield and St. Étienne was covered by a duty of 12 francs 7 centimes. See also Dunham, p. 166: "The duty of 30 per cent on pig-iron imposed by the treaty of 1860, and reduced to 25 per cent in 1864, as the treaty required, though representing a decrease of about 40 per cent from previous rates, gave real protection to the French ironmasters."

[35] Combes wrote that a reduction in duties on steel tools and implements would not injure French manufacturers and would be of great advantage to agriculture and shops for metal construction. The reductions were from 25 to 30 per cent on bars, sheets, implements, and tools. Combes to Ozenne, Oct. 16, 1866, Arch. Nat., F12-6471.

[36] Preparatory conferences, 5th sess., Paris, Oct. 30, 1866, Staatsarchiv, F5/V 54. A reduction on extra fine cottons had been made from the original proposal of 750 francs to 500 francs per 100 kg. (the duty of the general tariff was 1312 francs 50 centimes); on finest woolens from 350 to 225 francs; and on certain classes of linen goods made from jute from 30 to 15 francs.

The French silk industry had been going through a very critical period due to the ravages of silkworm diseases and increased competition. France therefore insisted on an immediate reduction to 600 francs and a drop to 400 francs at the end of five years.[37] She wished also to use this concession to win support for the treaty, and Pretis recommended that in view of the circumstances Austria concede the 600 franc duty, but that she should not agree to a lower level than 500 francs after five years.[38] In the final bargaining at Vienna, however, France secured all that she asked for.[39]

Questions regarding the treaty of navigation were settled without much difficulty. The French tariff on wooden and iron ships was reduced substantially, and shipbuilding materials were placed on the free list, concessions of particular value to the ports of Trieste and Fiume.[40]

The important point of reciprocity in indirect as well as direct trade was settled satisfactorily for Austria at last. Reciprocal treatment in respect to navigation dues was stipulated in the treaty.[41] By virtue of the new merchant marine law of May 19, 1866, all ships using French ports were to be freed of tonnage taxes after January 1, 1867, and in June, 1869, the *surtaxes de pavillon* applicable to foreign ships in indirect

[37] *Ibid.*

[38] Pretis to Wüllerstorf, Nov. 1. 10, 1866, Arch. I. J. H., 1674/HM. Pretis gives a detailed report of his work at Paris since his arrival.

[39] See Wüllerstorf to Pretis, Nov. 7, and Pretis to Wüllerstorf, Nov. 8, on the question of textile duties, *ibid.* The latter report covers all matters discussed since his report of Nov. 1; Drouyn de Lhuys to Gramont, Nov. 9, transmitted by the latter to Wüllerstorf Nov. 14, *ibid.*, 1722/HM, 1866. Also Auszug aus dem Minister-Raths Protokoll vom 20 November 1866, III, Handelsvertrag mit Frankreich, Staatsarchiv, F5/V 54. The conference authorized the reduction to 600 and 400 francs, and passed on several other questions still unsettled. A secret protocol was signed along with the Treaty of Commerce. Austria wished to postpone reductions on certain metal wares until she could use them in bargaining with the Zollverein. France, desirous of even lower duties on silks than stipulated in the treaty, was willing to bargain further that if Austria saw fit to reduce the duty on pure silk goods to 300 francs instead of 400 from January 1, 1872, as the treaty provided, she would lower the duty on ticking and linen damask from sixteen to twelve per cent ad valorem. A secret agreement covering these points was therefore drawn up and became part of the treaty. Austria said she would reduce the duty on 12 florins on metal wares as soon as negotiations with the Zollverein were finished, and in any case would lower the duty to 6 florins from Jan. 1, 1869. Preparatory conferences, 15th sess., Dec. 7, 1866, Annex B, Articles secrets, Staatsarchiv, ad F5/V 54.

[40] From 20-60 francs to 2 francs per metric ton. Prior to 1860 the importation of foreign-built ships was prohibited. Reports of Pretis to Wüllerstorf, Nov. 8 and 10, Arch. I. J. H., 1674/HM, 1866.

[41] The Treaty of Commerce is no. 387; the Treaty of Navigation is no. 388; the Final Protocol is no. 389, and the three conventions nos. 390, 391, and 392, Neumann and Plason, vol. IV.

trade were to be abolished.[42] However, by specific provision in Article I of the Treaty of Navigation, Austria enjoyed this latter concession beginning January 1, 1867, when the treaty became effective, instead of in 1869. Furthermore, by virtue of most-favored-nation treaties recently concluded by France with important commercial states such as England, Germany, and Belgium, this substantial advantage was passed on to the latter. Article I of the treaty again became of great importance to these states when the French government re-established the *surtaxes de pavillon* and *d'entrepôt* in January, 1872. As long as the treaty and their most-favored-nation agreements with France were in force, the reimposition of these taxes did not apply to their commerce. The significance of this treaty in the commercial relations of Europe is thus apparent.

The treaties and conventions were concluded and signed on December 11, 1866, and ratifications were speedily exchanged.[43] There was, of course, no approval by the Reichsrath, as that body, suspended on September 20, 1865, did not meet again until May 20, 1867. The long negotiation was at an end, but there remain two matters to be considered: the reception of the treaty by public opinion, and, still more important, some illustrations of its influence.

There was little comment on the treaties in the press of either Austria or France.[44] In each country they had been carried through as a part of the government's program of economic reform and in neither case was it necessary to subject the projects to the fire of parliamentary debate and publicity involved in securing legislative sanction. From the standpoint of French industry the Treaty of Commerce contained recognized advantages, and Austrian competition was not greatly feared. In general, Austrian opinion was favorable to the new agreements. The climax of the struggle over commercial policy had already passed in the last days of the Zollverein crisis, and the opposition to the new governmental

[42] The project for the reform of the merchant marine was presented to the Corps législatif on Mar. 26, 1865. It was opposed vigorously by the protectionists of that body but passed on May 19, 1866, by a large majority. E. Levasseur, *Histoire du Commerce de la France* (Paris, 1912), II, 304.

[43] Staatsarchiv, F5/V 41a, Dec. 17, 1866. Emperor Francis Joseph had granted permission on Nov. 11 to conclude the treaty, *ibid.*, 35b. Minister of foreign affairs to minister of finance, Dec. 20, 1866, Arch Finanz., ad 7054/FM, 1866. Arch. Nat., F12-6237, nos. 865-868.

[44] *Le moniteur industriel*, the organ of the French industrialists which had opposed the Treaty of 1860 so bitterly, gave brief notes on the progress of negotiations, and later ran a short series of informational articles on trade with Austria and the opportunities presented by the Treaty of Commerce. See issues of Jan. 6, 13, 24, and Feb. 3, 1867. The *Neue freie Presse* of Vienna also gave brief notes on the negotiations. See especially the morning edition of Nov. 16 and Dec. 10, 13, 14, 15, 1866.

policy had diminished definitely as the double defeat at the hands of Prussia brought a clearer revelation of Austria's disadvantageous position. Even the protectionists had become reconciled in a measure to tariff reductions. It must be remembered, also, that the negotiations were secret, and the public did not know any specific terms until the government saw fit to inform it. Hungary, with her agrarian interests and free trade principles, was strongly in favor of commercial treaties, and hence welcomed the new agreements with France.

Unquestionably France secured more concessions for her trade through these agreements than did Austria.[45] This was a quite natural result of the situation. France already had gone far along the path of liberal tariff reform since 1860; Austria was just entering it. The latter was in a position where reductions were inevitable, and had to content herself with whatever concessions she was able to secure in the process. Reductions on steel and machinery, on a variety of Viennese wares which were important to her export trade, and on ships were especially noteworthy gains in the treaty.

But there were great consequent advantages to Austria other than those resulting from lower duties on her exports. It has been pointed out that the chief significance of the treaty lay in its instrumentality in the program of liberal tariff reform and in the stimulation of the industrial revolution in Austria. Though the system of prohibitions was abandoned in principle with the tariff reforms of 1851 and 1853, it remained in fact until the treaty era of the sixties, and we find that these treaties, especially those with Germany, England, and France, were responsible in large measure for bringing Austrian industry and trade out of the backward state in which they had remained so long, chiefly because of the unhealthy protection afforded by that system. It is true that the movement for liberalization of the tariff began before the opening of negotiations with France in 1865, but it is important to remember that it was then mainly in the direction of a German economic union. The treaty concluded with the Zollverein in 1865 provided for no maximum tariff level, and many of its specific duties were soon out of date, as the swing of the government to the new liberal policy became more complete. The treaty with England in the same year contained a most-favored-nation clause and set up a maximum for duties, but there was no conventional tariff included, this being reserved for a supplementary convention following the conclusion of the French treaty. The latter contained both the most-favored-nation clause and a tariff schedule. In

[45] These are noted in the *Neue freie Presse*, Dec. 15, 1866.

several respects this treaty was more liberal than the treaties which France had concluded with England, Italy, and Germany; it contained many duties which were lower than those in the treaty between Austria and the Zollverein and provided a new tariff level for the supplementary convention with England. The Treaty of 1866 was, therefore, the final step in the inauguration of a moderate tariff policy in Austria, which found its full expression in the treaty with the North German Confederation in 1868.[46] No further appreciable change was made in the Austrian tariff, except through treaty, prior to 1878, when a new general tariff was adopted.[47]

From the standpoint of Austria's own economic life, the treaty is significant as a factor in her industrial revolution. By creating healthy competition, it forced changes in methods and equipment which industry had long needed; it helped to provide materials and machinery for these changes in the necessary quantities and at lower costs; it aided in bringing about conditions which resulted in the great forward movement in economic development which came in the sixties and seventies.[48] The continuation of the old general tariff without the reductions of the new conventional tariffs would have meant an increasing burden on the industries of the monarchy receiving raw materials from other nations.[49]

[46] See Johann von Bazant, *Die Handelspolitik Österreich-Ungarns 1875 bis 1892 in ihrem Verhältnis zum Deutschen Reiche und zu dem westlichen Europa* (Leipzig, 1894), p. 10.

[47] Revision of the general tariff had been under consideration for over ten years. Actually, the conventional tariffs were the ones that were used. *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[48] In requesting the emperor's permission to sign the treaties and conventions, Beust reviewed some of the salient features and expressed the conviction "that in the long run the workings of the complete system of commercial treaties would be essentially favorable to domestic industry—granted the continuance of peace—and that the French Treaty in particular would bring direct favorable results for many of Austria's leading industries". Vortrag, Dec. 8, 1866, Staatsarchiv, F5/V 38a.

[49] During the years of the conventional tariffs there was a great increase in imports of cotton, wool, flax, iron, and other raw materials. The following table shows the increased activity in leading raw materials indicative of growing industrial production in Austria following 1866. For comparison, figures for the two five-year periods prior to the treaty era are given. Figures are in metric centners.

		1856–60	1861–65	1866–70	1871–75	1879
Cotton	Imports	395,050	249,212	389,928	513,276	697,697
	Exports	3,426	11,454	26,280	17,799	35,246
Cotton thread	Imports	72,365	67,470	86,528	116,078	112,166
	Exports	2,571	2,697	2,059	3,416	4,619
Wool	Imports	99,025	112,682	131,790	151,784	196,555
	Exports	113,629	164,737	135,019	125,726	79,603
Wool yarn	Imports	13,454	17,572	28,860	34,967	38,497
	Exports	1,541	5,233	5,191	10,964	14,965
Flax and hemp	Imports	93,865	137,025	188,030	290,089	358,456
	Exports	28,896	48,951	33,489	45,888	56,189
Iron, pig and scrap	Imports	246,028	152,214	959,868	1,487,538	634,163
	Exports	17,220	34,095	42,288	57,522	84,407

On the other hand, many of her industries were expanding their production, and the opportunity to secure advantages in foreign markets was welcomed by them.

Industry did not complain of the results of the treaty policy during the good times of 1867-1872. There was general agreement that the reductions of the tariff had not brought the difficulties that had been anticipated by many, and that much good had resulted.[50] But the crisis of 1873 weighed heavily upon Austria, curbing development and spreading a feeling of distrust and insecurity. It was natural that under such conditions the commercial policy of the government should have been blamed for most of the trouble, and that protectionist sentiment should have shown a marked increase during these years.[51] The greatest complaint came from the cotton spinners and iron manufacturers, representing industries which had been forced to change their methods and equipment radically in order to meet foreign competition. The more advanced industries such as brewing, sugar, porcelain, and glass had comparatively little complaint to make against the treaty policy. "Industry suffers in competition with foreign lands", wrote the chamber of commerce of Eger, in Bohemia, when submitting its opinion on the tariff to the government in 1868, "but the advantages of division of labor, use of machinery, and cheapness of raw materials partly balance these disadvantages and make large establishments, especially, able to meet competition in spite of the advances in a free-trade direction which the commercial policy of Austria has made." In the following year it wrote that in spite of difficulties inherent in the change of policy, "it must be admitted that it has not injured industry in the degree that was predicted". Even in 1876, in the midst of the difficulties following the great crisis, it held to its former position, and declared that in general

In addition to increased domestic consumption, exports of cotton goods rose from an average of 11,504 metric centners for the period 1861-65 to 26,555 met. ctrs. for the year 1879, ironware from 83,438 to 172,856 met. ctrs., glass and glassware from 112,483 to 273,584, paper from 60,912 to 200,006, and woolen goods from 33,728 to 49,338 metric centners in the same period. *Ausweise über den auswärtige Handel Österreichs*, K. K. Statistische Central-Commission.

The yearly production of coal rose from 37,872,863 metric centners for the decade 1858-67 to 94,282,023 metric centners for the decade 1868-77. Viktor Wolff, *Entwicklung von Industrie und Gewerbe in Österreich 1848-1888* (Vienna, 1888), p. 3.

[50] A. Beer, pp. 451-452.

[51] "The distinctive marks of the situation", wrote a distinguished Austrian economist as late as 1876, "are a lack of confidence and a steadily growing feeling of discouragement." F. X. de Neumann-Spallart, "Lettres d'Autriche", *L'économiste français*, July 22, 1876, p. 111. In 1874 a committee of the Reichsrath was named to examine the causes of the crisis of 1873. While its report contained criticism of some governmental policies, it does not list the liberal commercial treaties as a cause.

the treaties with Germany and France could not be characterized as unfavorable to the development of industry and trade.[52] Faint praise, perhaps, but significant when the industrial nature of the source is considered.

During the discussion in 1875 of a new general tariff, the chamber of Troppau in Silesia, center of many industries, favored the treaty tariffs as the basis for the revision. Here was a protectionist center which had opposed the union with the Zollverein in 1864 and which called the Franco-Prussian Treaty a "monstrous creation" because of its low rates, admitting that the level of duties set up in the treaties of commerce was more desirable than the old general tariff.[53] The chamber at Brünn, another center of protection, favored the adoption of an autonomous tariff, feeling that the Treaty of 1866 had been of more advantage to France than to Austria, but it did admit that Austrian exports of foodstuffs and raw materials had benefited greatly by the most-favored-nation clause.[54]

The evidence before us proves that the treaty policy adopted during the sixties did not bring the evil effects which had been prophesied, but produced much positive good. The facts demonstrate clearly that industries generally were not ruined by the tariff, but were in a more highly developed state than ever before. "One could not hold, with any show of reason", wrote Neumann-Spallart, the Austrian economist, "that the policy which concluded commercial treaties with France, Belgium, Holland, Italy, Germany, and a large number of other European states had produced any other than advantageous results for our commercial relations."[55] This seems to be a fair judgment of the net result.

This treaty with France, concluded for a period of ten years, actually remained in force for twelve years, until January 1, 1879. For five years longer a few of the conventional duties were retained. The benefits of both the Treaty of Commerce and the Treaty of Navigation had been

[52] *Gutachten der Handels- und Gewerbekammer von Eger* (Eger, 1868), p. 67; *ibid.* (1876), p. 2.

[53] *Gutachten der Handels- und Gewerbekammer von Troppau* (1875).

[54] *Bericht der III. Section über die Revision des österreichisch-französisch Handels-Vertrages* (Brünn, 1876).

[55] "Le régime douanier et les traités de commerce", *L'économiste français*, Oct. 13, 1877, p. 453. Treaties with Belgium, Netherlands, and Italy were concluded in 1867. In 1868 came a new and important treaty with the North German Confederation and one with Switzerland. By 1875 Austria had also concluded treaties with Siam, China, Japan, Spain, Portugal, Sweden and Norway, and Rumania. A Supplementary Convention was concluded with England in 1869. See Neumann and Plason, vols. IV, V, and VI.

spread among the principal nations of Europe during this time. It was not until 1884 that the commercial relations of the two nations were placed on a simple most-favored-nation basis. Thus we see that the influence of the treaty was more than passing, and upon it as a foundation were established better relations between Austria and all Western Europe. The treaty came at a time when new forces were at work bringing about great changes in the commercial and industrial life of Austria; it was accompanied by other reforms which added to the material welfare of the monarchy. The great contribution of the treaty lay in strengthening these forces and in hastening, during the liberal era, the reforms which brought so much of sound economic progress to Austria.

DWIGHT C. LONG.

The University of Michigan.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

JOHN F. CRAMPTON, CONSPIRATOR OR DUPE?

JOHN F. Crampton, British minister to the United States, was dismissed on May 28, 1856, on charges of personally breaking the American neutrality act of 1818. His expulsion was the climax to a heated controversy between Great Britain and the United States which had begun with the sending of an official protest on June 9, 1855, by William L. Marcy, the American Secretary of State, against certain alleged British recruiting practices conducted on American soil.

The American charges rested partly on common report and partly on certain testimony submitted in a state trial held in Philadelphia in September, 1855, of one Henry Hertz, who "confessed" to having been employed by Crampton as a recruiting agent. The case attracted much attention and disagreement in England, where a domestic political crisis, in part because of it, was narrowly averted. There were even members of Lord Palmerston's cabinet who were at a loss where to place the blame. Outside of the cabinet Lord John Russell placed it squarely on the shoulders of Crampton. Gladstone, on the other hand, blamed the government, charging it with making a scapegoat of its minister.[1]

Valuable contributions to an understanding of this subject have already been made by Dr. H. Barrett Learned and Dr. J. Bartlet Brebner.[2] The former, in his sketch of the career of William L. Marcy, drew his conclusions respecting the enlistment matter principally from a study of the parliamentary bluebooks. Dr. Brebner has supplemented Dr. Learned's work, and to some extent modified it, by an examination of the private papers of Joseph Howe, the "tribune of Nova Scotia", who played an important, though concealed role in the recruiting activities.

But Crampton's side of the case, his alleged "guilt", and the responsibility of the British government for his acts, have never been settled definitively. Parallel with the regular dispatches from the British legation

[1] Wood to Clarendon, June 22, and Harrowby to Clarendon, July 15, 1856, Clarendon Papers; Russell to Clarendon, June 7, 1856, *ibid.*; *Parliamentary Debates*, 3d ser., vol. CXLIII, cols. 120–206.

[2] Samuel Flagg Bemis, *The American Secretaries of State and their Diplomacy* (New York, 1928), "William Learned Marcy", by Henry Barrett Learned, VI, 145–294. J. Bartlet Brebner, "Joseph Howe and the Crimean War Enlistment Controversy between Great Britain and the United States", *Canadian Historical Review*, XI (Dec., 1930), 300–327.

in Washington to the foreign office, but invariably giving a more intimate and complete, and sometimes a different, account, went a series of lengthy personal letters from Crampton to Lord Clarendon. These missives Crampton customarily wrote once a week and, whenever possible, sent by special messenger on board a British packet.[3] Practically nothing is to be found in the official archives of the foreign office, or of the British legation in Washington, that is not already available in the *Parliamentary Papers*.[4] But in the private papers of Lord Clarendon there are sixteen letters from Crampton on the subject, dating from December 4, 1854, to August 7, 1855, and it is the purpose of this article to unfold Crampton's story as disclosed by these letters.

The British Foreign Enlistment Act of December 23, 1854, was the basis for the recruiting activities, but the possibilities of the United States as a fertile field for recruits were considered by Lord Clarendon more than a month before the passage of this act, and indeed appear to have been an important factor in inducing the government to introduce it. A letter from Consul George B. Mathew of Philadelphia, declaring that a strong battalion could be embarked from Philadelphia for the Crimea within a week if only the financial means were available, was commented on favorably by at least one member of the cabinet in addition to Lord Clarendon.[5] The latter sent an immediate request to Crampton to circularize the other consuls for information, but before the minister could make his report the cabinet introduced the bill into Parliament.

Crampton followed Clarendon's instructions, but was not hopeful of results. "I do not, I confess, anticipate that we shall be able to do much in that way", he responded, "nor does Consul Mathew's opinion weigh much with me, for he is a terrible talker and discoverer of mare's nests,

[3] The Clarendon Papers. The author was given the great privilege of studying these papers extensively through the generous assistance of Professor Harold Temperley and Mr. S. C. Ratcliff, secretary of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, and the courtesy of the Rt. Hon. the Sixth Earl of Clarendon. He found this collection to be of rare value in his study of Anglo-American relations between 1850 and 1860. In addition to the formidable number of letters from Crampton, and later Lord Napier, to the foreign secretary, there are numerous letters to Clarendon from various members of the cabinet on American affairs.

[4] The volumes in the Public Record Office embracing the period of Crampton's enlistment activities are: F.O. 5/616, 617, 619 to 622; and F.O. 115/151 to 156. The printed documents are in *Parl. Papers* [Command 2080, 2108, 2094], 1856, *Accounts and Papers*, vol. LX, "Papers relative to Recruiting in the United States", "Further Papers relative to Recruiting in the United States", and "Papers respecting Recruiting in the United States, not already published in the Papers laid before Parliament, 2 May 1856, re-printed from a Collection of Papers, entitled 'Messages of the President' ".

[5] Graham to Clarendon, Nov. 17, 1854, Clarendon Papers.

and not a discreet person in his proceedings." It would be essential to avoid taking any measures which could legally be construed as enlisting men on American soil, he added; there were too many persons in the United States ready to exploit the British consuls for their own political advantage.[6]

It was more than two months before Crampton took any further steps. In the meantime the reports from the consuls were highly enthusiastic, and Crampton heard again from Lord Clarendon, urging him to take action. Early in February the minister was still dubious, but had reached the point where he thought "something [might] be done".

> The difficulty [he explained] is as to the means of helping those who are inclined to go, but have not the means of defraying their travelling expenses. If we were to *advance* money we should have no security as to its being used for the proper purpose; and although we might promise that such expenses would be reimbursed on the arrival of the people at the Depot, this would only enable those who could pay their own way in the first instance to come. As the wish to join us arises out of the want of work and distress, I fear the numbers of those who could do so would be small.

"Nevertheless", he concluded, "by the intervention of a trustworthy agent the thing might be managed. . . ."[7]

By February 12 Crampton had worked out a definite plan, which he sent to Sir Edmund Head, the governor of Canada, for approval. Everything depended for its execution upon the latter's co-operation, for it involved the "procuring and sending to Canada as voluntary emigrants such persons who may desire to *enlist there*. . . ."

> I am in communication with two or three persons who appear to be sufficiently trustworthy and intelligent to enable us at all events to make the experiment on a moderate scale, and without any risk of being charged with a violation of the Neutrality Law of the U. S. If we succeed in the first instance we can extend our operations.
>
> All my informants agree that the method proposed is the best that could be adopted, and profess themselves ready to act upon it the moment I say the word. If there is no great delay in the arrangements in Canada, I think we might obtain a considerable number of men from the U. S.; but our chances of doing so will diminish as spring advances and the demand for labour increases.
>
> The moment therefore that I am informed that depots are formed in Canada for the reception of recruits, and that I am enabled to let it be known upon what terms they will be enrolled and to what point they are to direct themselves, I propose to set one or two of my agents at work to convey them to the appointed places. Such advances of money as I shall have to make must necessarily be made in trust to the Agent who shall under-

[6] Crampton to Clarendon, Private, Dec. 4, 1854, *ibid.*

[7] *Ibid.*, Feb. 4, 1855.

take to convey the men, for any written engagement would bring us under the provisions of the Neutrality Laws. But the outlay will not be considerable in any one instance; and if the Agent was to fail to fulfil his engagement as to the first batch of men, we should of course not employ him again and abandon the whole project as a failure. The thing must therefore be looked upon as an experiment; but it is one which I think likely to succeed, and of which the risk of trying is not great. Until otherwise instructed I shall charge any money which I may advance for this purpose to the *Secret Service Account*. The people we shall get, if we get any, will be principally Germans, and among them I am promised a good number of intelligent non-commissioned officers and others who have served in Schleswig-Holstein. The number of British subjects will I think be small.[8]

This letter is the only communication which Crampton made on the subject to Lord Clarendon until March 12, when he reported the results of his conference with Joseph Howe. From it it is clear that Crampton had warmed considerably to the idea, and that he had gone so far as to retain tentatively the services of certain agents. It is also clear that he was seeking a method not of *violating* the American laws, but of keeping within them. Furthermore, since the plan depended upon the co-operation of the Canadian authorities, and since the latter had not yet signified their consent, it is plain that it existed only on paper.

But Canadian co-operation was not easily forthcoming. Lieutenant General William Rowan, in charge of the British forces in North America, replied to Crampton with a host of practical objections: there were no depots in Canada at which to receive recruits, there were not enough officers to discipline them, the men could not be transported down the river until after the ice had broken up, etc., etc.[9]

Support came, however, from Nova Scotia. Joseph Howe arrived in Washington on March 9, full of zest for the cause, and since he held no office he was in an admirable position to take over the management of the campaign from Crampton.[10] Dr. Brebner has narrated the story of the conference that followed between the two men from Howe's point of view.[11] Howe was unquestionably more sanguine than Crampton, and more aggressive, but the latter, though restrained in his expressions of hope, as naturally became his dignified post, by no means resigned his role to Howe, as Dr. Brebner infers. "I am hard at work on the subject of the recruitment", the minister recorded on March 12, after

[8] *Ibid.*, Feb. 12, 1855.

[9] *Ibid.*, Montreal, Feb. 14, 1855.

[10] In the meantime Clarendon had again written Crampton, Feb. 16, urging him to take steps to obtain recruits, but at the same time to observe the neutrality laws. Brebner, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 307–308.

the interview. "What it may bring forth I do not know but at least the experiment shall be tried. Sir Gaspard le Marchant has sent down Mr. Howe . . . a sharp and active man who seems well qualified for the work we have in hand." [12]

Since General Rowan had virtually refused to have anything to do with the plan, it was naturally decided between Crampton and Howe that Halifax should be the rendezvous. There was every need for haste. Sir Gaspard had promised to "receive any men I send him and as you [Clarendon] wish me to act *promptly,* which indeed is a sine quânon to success, I have determined to go ahead at once and do what I can".

> As Her Majesty's Govt. [he continued] wish the thing to be done we can of course run no risk in acting before technical and detailed instructions are sent out—merely to report as to the practicability of the scheme and then to wait two months for authority to try it would be in fact equivalent to abandoning it altogether, for if anything is to be done it must be done *now*.—So soon as the present state of the labour market changes, as it is sure to do as spring advances, there will be an end of the numerous offers which are now made to me.[13]

Crampton had also taken the precaution of asking his Washington counsel, Mr. J. Mandeville Carlisle, for an opinion regarding the neutrality law. Mr. Carlisle was cautious, but not absolutely discouraging to the now somewhat eager minister.

> [The neutrality law, Crampton wrote] confines us to narrow limits in our measures here, but I think we shall be able to show some people the way to Halifax without 'hiring or retaining' them. The expense of a voyage from Boston or New York to Halifax is small and if we can get some Nova Scotia vessels whose masters will give credit, the passage money can be paid on arrival.
>
> Once there, I have no fear of the recruits not enlisting for in Nova Scotia at this season they would find nothing else to do. I hope if instructions to Sir Gaspard to raise and enrol troops are not already on the way that they may be sent out at once—for otherwise some technical difficulty or delay in providing for such people may deter others from following their example.

Finally, Crampton considered the idea of consulting Marcy, but rejected it, for if there were any recruits they would "go as voluntary emigrants and the less we say about it the better".[14]

Between March 10 and May 2 the actual work of securing men was done by Howe, through his contacts with agents, but the money was supplied in large part by Crampton out of the secret service account. Altogether the minister spent £5250 in the campaign.[15]

[12] Crampton to Clarendon, Private, Mar. 12, 1855, Clarendon Papers.

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] Clarendon to Crampton, no. 129, May 30, 1856, F.O. 5/639.

Howe proved so energetic that almost at once his agents attracted the attention of the newspapers. One of them, a certain Angus McDonald, opened up a recruiting office in New York and advertised for men.[16] At first Crampton was inclined to regard this activity with complacency.

> That opposition would be made to our obtaining men from the U. S. [he wrote] and that any movement for that purpose which must of necessity have been public, would afford material for the newspapers was no more than I expected and was of course prepared for. However as the agitation on the matter has shown that a disposition to join our army really does exist to a considerable extent, and as there is after all no law which can prevent any number of people from availing themselves of our offers, *so long as we keep fairly within the limits of the Neutrality Laws,* nothing that has yet occurred seems to me to be fatal to the sweep of the operation if properly managed.[17]

Nevertheless, Crampton was critical of Howe for distributing tickets and circulating handbills and advertisements, and "did what I [he] could to put a stop to them". Howe was summoned to Washington, where the whole matter was reviewed carefully in the presence of Mr. Carlisle, "upon whose knowledge of the law and good advice as to the best mode of proceeding I entirely rely".

> The district attorney [McKeon?] talks loud . . . but Mr. Carlisle is not of the opinion, even if a prosecution should be attempted, and some of these people held to bail that any case can be made out against them; and Mr. Howe is fully instructed as to the legal precautions he is to take in the event of any attempt being made to implicate him.

"In short", Crampton concluded, "I think that what has happened will do no more than practically to test the matter and let people see what can and what cannot be done consistently with the Law."[18]

Furthermore, the minister thought it was time now to "explain to Marcy with perfect frankness our position and intentions as regards this matter". The Secretary of State "concurred in the correctness of my position and said that he had never doubted that this was the view I would take of the question . . .".[19]

Thus reassured, Crampton had a right to expect caution on the part of Howe. But the latter learned nothing from his second conference, and in fact wrote to Le Marchant on the very same day that he did not *expect* to keep within the neutrality law.[20] True, Howe was patriotic,

[16] Brebner, *op. cit.*, pp. 310–313.

[17] Crampton to Clarendon, Private, Mar. 26, 1855. Clarendon Papers. Italics mine.

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] *Ibid. Cf.* Learned, *op. cit.*, pp. 242–243. To be sure, "perfect frankness" did not include the information that Crampton was actually paying out money from the secret service account. Thus Marcy was really given a false impression.

[20] Brebner, *op. cit.*, pp. 315–316.

but it was he who in large part involved Crampton in trouble later.

During the next fortnight Crampton heard little from Howe, but still retained his confidence. On April 9 he wrote:

> I have given letters of introduction to Sir Gaspard Le Marchant to a few German officers who have been recommended to me by the Prussian minister here. We may pick up a few people of this sort in the United States but I doubt that either their numbers or those of the recruits will be very considerable. I am upon a perfectly good understanding with Mr. Marcy on this subject. . . . So far the noise that has been made in the papers has acted as an advertisement and will forward the business if there is really any material for it to work upon. Mr. Howe is not a man to be easily frightened, and the experiment will at least be fairly tried.[21]

Crampton's sangfroid changed to anxiety in May.

> Not feeling altogether satisfied or easy about the proceedings of the House [of Representatives?] with respect to the recruitment and finding that I cannot possibly prevent the occurrence of blunders and misunderstandings unless I take the matter into my own hands, I have decided to go up to Canada in the first instance, and speak to Sir E. Head, and then to Halifax to confer with Sir Gaspard Le Marchant. . . I can then return to Boston and New York and see what can be done in strict conformity with the Neutrality Laws, the real bearing of which I have found it very difficult to impress upon anybody who has been concerned in the business. My notion is that whatever is to be done can be effected without violating them in the least; but that any attempt to *evade* them by artful dodges will only defeat our object and give 'beau jeu' to Cushing and the other malignant spirits under his control, who only want to make themselves of importance by annoying us. My objection to Mr. Howe's proceedings, though I fully recognize his zeal and cleverness, is that he has given an air of mystery and intrigue to what can only be done with any effect publicly and loyally. Besides, I am most anxious not to have the appearance of taking one position in regard to this matter in my communications with Mr. Marcy and another through Mr. Howe or any other real or supposed agent. I am therefore not sorry that he has gone back to Nova Scotia, for his movements have lately been so erratic and obscure that I have had difficulty in following or understanding them much less controlling them. I hope therefore that by putting my own shoulder to the wheel I may be able to prevent any mischief if I cannot effect any good. I enclose the last Reports I have received from Mr. Howe from which you will probably gather what my motives are for my present proceeding without my entering into them further. I also enclose a letter I received this morning from Sir E. Head which shows that Howe while on the one hand he is too mysterious is on the other somewhat imprudent.[22]

Meanwhile Crampton had received from the foreign office only one

[21] Crampton to Clarendon, Private, Apr. 9, 1855, Clarendon Papers.

[22] *Ibid.*, May 2, 1855. Thus Crampton went to confer with Head and Le Marchant on his own motion, and not as the result of urging by Howe. *Cf.* Brebner, *op. cit.*, p. 319. On the contrary, one of Crampton's main reasons for going was to undo the mischief which Howe had created.

communication on the matter since the general instruction of February 16. This was a brief message from Clarendon, dated April 12, expressing approval of Crampton's procedure as reported in his dispatch of March 12, and reiterating the statement that in no circumstances were the neutrality laws of the United States to be infringed.[23]

In three private letters to Lord Clarendon, dated respectively Boston, May 9, Quebec, May 20, and Washington, June 3, 1855, Crampton gave a complete account of his activities in Nova Scotia and Canada.[24] At first his conversations with General Rowan and Sir Edmund Head, in Montreal and Quebec respectively, were inconclusive, but after four days with Sir Gaspard in Halifax, where he saw recruits arriving with his own eyes, he returned to Quebec with what he thought was a workable plan. The German officers already enlisted at Halifax had assured him that there really were "intending Germans" in the American towns just across the frontier, and that all that need be done was to send a few agents over the border to convey the necessary information regarding the facilities in Canada for entering the service. Accordingly five German and two British officers accompanied Crampton to Quebec, from whence they crossed the lakes to Buffalo, Detroit, and Cleveland.

Crampton now felt confident that he had "set the business of recruiting the Foreign Legion in such a train as will at least enable us to judge before long whether it is an object worth pursuing or not. . . ."

> I have got the ends of all the threads of the business here [he continued] into my own hands, so that nothing either dangerous or unfeasable [*sic*]

[23] *Parl. Papers*, 1856, *Accounts and Papers*, vol. LX, "Papers relative to Recruiting in the United States", p. 12. This dispatch was evidently in reply to the official communication from Crampton of Mar. 12 (*ibid.*, p. 7), not to the private letter cited above. There is no indication that Clarendon replied to any of Crampton's private letters on the subject.

By prearrangement this dispatch was shown to Marcy by J. Saville Lumley, the chargé, in Crampton's absence, and it elicited the secretary's approval. Lumley was also to assure Marcy that Crampton's object in going to Canada was "to prevent and not to favour any proceedings which may be undertaken whether by an officer of ours or by others on their own responsibility which should seem to contemplate a violation or evasion of the law". Crampton to Clarendon, Private, May 2, 1855, Clarendon Papers.

According to Dr. Learned (*op. cit.*, p. 253), it was the information conveyed by Lumley's reading of Clarendon's dispatch that "aroused Marcy's suspicion of the good faith of the British Government". That this should have been so was indeed most unfortunate for poor Crampton, who had intended it to have just the opposite effect.

Crampton's private letter proves that he had no concerted plan when he left for Canada. It is therefore somewhat unjust to him to say that he went "primarily to extend the machinery for recruiting to cities in the United States bordering on the Great Lakes". *Ibid.*, p. 250. This scheme was put forth only after Crampton had been to Halifax.

[24] Thus it is an error to say that "Not until November 27 did Crampton attempt to explain his absence to Clarendon; then he deceived the British Minister by camouflaging the truth.' *Ibid.*, pp. 249–250.

can now be attempted before I am aware of it. I have discarded all offers involving schemes which appeared to be rash and impracticable, while on the other hand efficient machinery is now supplied for carrying into effect those which hold out a reasonable prospect of success. Mr. Howe had unfortunately accepted every plan which was proposed to him and given encouragement to certain people to enter upon operations which under the circumstances were sure to fail, and which generally involved a direct violation of the neutrality laws of the United States. Every failure in such attempts tended of course to diminish the chances of ultimate success besides putting us in a false position as regards our relations with the American Govt.[25]

But Crampton's satisfaction was short lived. At the end of a fortnight he made a trip to Niagara "in order to ascertain whether the Germans we had placed about the lakes were doing any business or not".

I found that after a fortnight's fair play with all the facilities they themselves had asked for no result at all proportional to the expense of the organization had been obtained or seemed likely to be so; I had them therefore immediately recalled and sent back to Halifax.[26]

A Colonel Korponay, with whom Howe had earlier made arrangements, however, "appeared in a way to do better", so one British officer was left at Niagara to give him a fair chance

. . . under the distinct understanding with him that if his plan did not within a reasonable time show decided symptoms of success or was to break down from interference by the United States authorities or from any other cause, it was at once to be abandoned. A very short time will now determine whether anything will come of it or not. Should it end in smoke, or like the others, produce insignificant results, I think we ought to give the thing up altogether.[27]

Meanwhile on June 22 Clarendon had written Crampton an official

[25] Crampton to Clarendon, Private, June 3, 1855, Clarendon Papers. The remainder of this letter describes minutely the pains that were taken to make the project a useful and at the same time a lawful one. It should not be overlooked that a part of the plan was linked up with the previous activities of Howe. *Cf.* Brebner, *op. cit.*, pp. 317–319. Crampton concludes his letter as follows: "If Sir Gaspard Le Marchant can only get together a sufficient number of men to turn out at Halifax a single well clothed and equipped battalion, I think the effect would be to draw a great many more people from the United States. The fact would soon become notorious and would defeat the efforts of those in the Russian interest who are doing all they can to throw cold water on the recruitment for the British Foreign Legion by representing the whole thing to be a failure.

"Such is the present state of the recruitment question. Whether we shall obtain a force which will be worth the trouble and expense of raising it in this way remains to be seen—but I hope that I have at last substituted a plan which *may* succeed for others which were certain to fail."

[26] Clarendon Papers, July 2, 1855.

[27] *Ibid.*

dispatch ordering him to stop all the proceedings and abandon the project. There has been much doubt expressed as to whether Crampton ever received this dispatch.[28] The answer is that he did receive it and acknowledged it in a private letter dated July 10. "I have received your letter of the 22d ultimo, and I have already put matters in regard to the Legion into the trains you wish", he writes. Crampton did not expand upon this remark, but the reader has a surprise when in the next letter on the subject, July 16, he finds the following:

> With regard to the recruitment, I have put a stop to all *fresh* measures for carrying it on or enlarging it, merely allowing Korponay and Smolenski to whom promises were made on Sir Gaspard's part by Mr. Howe, that they should have the command of the bodies of men they undertook to bring. I have thought it but fair to hold our word to them and to give them a fair chance of holding theirs. They would of course have been very indignant if we had suddenly backed out, and would probably have shown us up by publishing in the papers the very imprudent letters which Mr. Howe wrote to them. I have thought it right, however, to fix with them by agreement a limit as to the time and expense at the expiration of which these plans if not accomplished must be regarded as failures and definitely abandoned. From what I observe I think that they themselves will very soon have to acknowledge that the thing cant be done at least within a reasonable time or at a reasonable expense. The inherent difficulties of the enterprise are great. Besides the 'acharnement' of the American authorities and Press against it, the utter want of controul over our agents and over the recruits they may collect in a foreign and in this case I may almost say an *enemy's* country, paralyzes the whole operation. . . .

Even at the end of July recruiting was still in progress. But "although it is true that men are coming in somewhat quicker than they did, I think it is on the whole advisable to put a stop to it. 'Le jeu ne vaut pas la chandelle' . . .". The trial period given to Korponay and Smolenski "is now very nearly arrived without their having shown a reasonable prospect of being able to fulfil their engagements. I shall therefore anounce to them that such being the case the whole thing must be given up." [29]

But meanwhile in a note of July 16 Clarendon had informed Buchanan of the order contained in his dispatch of June 22 and had assured the American minister that Great Britain had no intention of violating American neutrality. When Crampton heard of this, he at last realized the seriousness of his predicament, and he "immediately put a stop to *all* proceedings in the business. . . . It is absolutely necessary that no case, legitimate or illegitimate, of an attempt to go on with that matter should

[28] Learned, *op. cit.*, p. 254.

[29] Crampton to Clarendon, Private, July 30, 1855, Clarendon Papers.

be brought up as having occurred *subsequent to your assurance to Mr. Buchanan* and any loss that we may incur by suddenly breaking up our arrangements is of course not to be taken into consideration."[30]

It is a nice question whether Crampton violated the American municipal law or not. That he was something of an experimenter with the law and willing to run a certain amount of risk for the sake of "the cause", he himself admits.[31] But that he also became convinced that the matter could be handled legally is clear. He had a basically wrong conception of the neutrality act, as the result showed. Yet the act, as he says, had to be tested, before its sweeping nature could be determined. The foreign office sent him an urgent request to get men for the army, and he did his best to carry out their wishes in difficult circumstances. He took reasonable precautions to keep within the law, and he supplied Lord Clarendon with detailed information as to his methods. The latter approved, and of course could not, with honor, repudiate him later, when the American administration demanded that he do so.

Crampton allowed himself to be imposed upon to some extent by Howe, and he made a serious practical blunder when, on his trip to Canada, he became involved in a fresh scheme of recruiting, the application of which differed from Howe's only in details. Howe's experiences might well have convinced him that the thing was impossible. But Crampton was above all things a loyal servant, albeit a trifle foolish perhaps, and subsequently paid the penalty which sometimes is exacted from loyalty of that kind.[32]

State College, RICHARD W. VAN ALSTYNE.
Chico, California.

[30] *Ibid.*, Aug. 7, 1855.

[31] Above, p. 497.

[32] Crampton's later private letters to Lord Clarendon, written during the winter of 1855–1856, reflect the bitterness which he felt toward what approached persecution at the hands of the American government.

DOCUMENTS

An Austrian Diplomat in America, 1840

JOHANN Georg Ritter von Hülsemann [1] was secretary of the Austrian legation in Washington from its establishment in 1838 to 1841, then chargé d'affaires to 1855, and finally, to 1863 Austrian minister to the United States. A doctor of jurisprudence, he had been a lecturer at Göttingen, and had published a *Geschichte der Demokratie in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika*.[2] In the introduction to this work, which is by no means a mere polemic, he expressly confesses a European monarchical point of view, from which the prevailing tendencies in America "appear distinctly hostile, and . . . as in definitive contradiction to those on which our civilization is based, and everything resting on this transatlantic basis pernicious". But, he charitably concludes, so long as the American principle is confined to territories beyond the seas, "we wish to view it merely as strange".[3]

For well over a decade prior to his appointment to Washington, Hülsemann had been used by Metternich for "publicistic-political elaborations" and for "various missions to Portugal and Italy", and was, according to the latter, most favorably reputed for his "morality and political principles".[4] As a diplomat he proved careful and conscientious, though somewhat pedantic. He conceived his task in the United States as negative, to prevent the "germination" of hostility toward Austria. Though carefully avoiding public expression of critical opinions, because of what he termed the "morbid sensitivity of the local public to criticism in European journals, etc.", he thought that "direct political collisions between Austria and the United States do not lie in the ordinary course of events".[5] "Through personal social intercourse" with American leaders he endeavored to create "a benevolent attitude", and thus forestall difficulties.[6] Moreover, his opinions changed somewhat in the

[1] Born, Stade, Hanover, 1799, died 1868. Short biographical notice in Johann Georg Meusel, *Das Gelehrte Teutschland* (Lemgo, 1831), vol. X.

[2] Göttingen, 1823. He also published *Ueber die Bedeutung der Diplomatie für die neuere und neueste Geschichte* (Göttingen, 1820).

[3] *Geschichte der Demokratie*, pp. viii–ix.

[4] Address of Metternich, Feb. 26, 1838, Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv.

[5] Hülsemann to Metternich, Nov. 30, 1843, Staatsarchiv, Berichte aus Nordamerika, no. 28a.

[6] *Ibid.*, no. 14, June 28, 1847.

course of his American experiences. New England democracy, with its stern Puritan discipline, won his unstinting praise. He admired the character of George Washington, though observing regretfully that there were no Washingtons in the American public life of his day.[7]

In the course of the forties he discovered with growing concern tendencies toward interference in European affairs, which could only mean difficulties with Austria. With the outbreak of 1848 in the Hapsburg dominions, and the American enthusiasm for the Magyar revolutionists, Hülsemann's position became increasingly awkward. The period culminated in his diplomatic tilt with Daniel Webster, on the occasion of Louis Kossuth's visit to the United States. This episode in Austro-American relations, the most significant between the early attempts of American revolutionists to win recognition from the court of Joseph II and Maria Theresa, and the Olympian pronouncements of Woodrow Wilson of World War days, is fully treated in Professor Merle Eugene Curti's *Austria and the United States, 1848-1852.*[8]

Hülsemann addressed four reports describing in detail his observations on an extended tour of the summer of 1849 to Baron von Mareschal,[9] Austrian minister to the United States, who in turn submitted them to Prince Metternich.[10] Mareschal in his accompanying letter, commented: "The work of M. de Hülsemann recommends itself; he observes well, and is able to give an account of his impressions; I will note however some points wherein my opinions differ from his, not in order to contradict the facts, which are exact, but to give you, My Prince, an equally faithful account of my impressions." I call attention to Mareschal's diverging opinions in footnotes 19 and 23 in the text below. The reports drew, so far as I know, no expression from Metternich. The following excerpts are taken from the first three of Hülsemann's reports.[11]

CLARENCE W. EFROYMSON.

Butler University.

[7] *Ibid.*, Apr. 27, 1843.

[8] Smith College Studies in History, vol. XI, no. 3, Northampton, 1926. Also Willis Fletcher Johnson, *America's Foreign Relations* (New York, 1916), I, 527; H. v. Holst, *Verfassung und Demokratie der Vereinigten Staaten* (Düsseldorf, 1873, ff.), vol. I, pt. 4, pp. 54 ff.; John Bassett Moore, *A Digest of International Law* (Washington, 1906), I, 221 ff. See also the biographical introduction (by Edward and William Everett) to *The Writings and Speeches of Daniel Webster* (Boston, 1903), I, 165 ff.

[9] Wenzel Phillipp Leopold Baron von Mareschal (1784–1851), minister to the United States, 1838–1841.

[10] Mareschal to Metternich, Oct. 13, 1840, Staatsarchiv, Nordamerika, no. 23. Photostatic copies, 82 prints (*i.e.*, pp. 0207–0288), are in the Library of Congress.

[11] The fourth report describes his visit to a Catholic colony founded in Maine by the

I

Washington, Sept. 30, 1840

Hochwohlgeborener Freiherr,

According to the instructions given me under date of May 29th, of this year, I repaired on the 6th of July, via Philadelphia, Pittsburg, to the state of Ohio, reached Cincinnati by land route via Canton, Columbus, and Dayton; from there by water to Louisville, whence I attempted to enter the state of Indiana via Vincennes, but had to give up this plan because of intervening floods, and was forced to journey to St. Louis by the Ohio and Mississippi. The same circumstances prevented my visiting the so-called Iron Mountains from St. Louis; [they] made easier on the other hand my journey up the Mississippi to the lead district of Galena [Illinois], since the small steamboats could pass without difficulty the rapids above the mouth of the Rivière des Moines and the Rock River, otherwise dangerous at this time of year. From Galena, on the Fever [Fevre] River four miles above the entrance of this stream in the Mississippi, I traveled with the mail stage over bottomless roads across prairies, which for great stretches were covered with one or two feet of water, to Chicago, where I embarked on the beautiful steamboat, the *Great Western,* hurried through Lakes Michigan, Huron, St. Clair, and Erie in five days, and, after short stays in Mackinaw, Detroit (Michigan), and Cleveland (Ohio), arrived in Buffalo.

An excursion to Rochester and Cananda[i]gua afforded me occasion to acquaint myself with western New York; and after a short stay at Niagara Falls, I did not go, as is usual, by steamboat to Toronto, but traveled half the way by land to Hamilton, passed the Welland Canal at St. Catharines, and saw a part of western Canada, fertile and well-cultivated, and seldom visited by travelers. After the discomforts of travel in the states of the Mississippi, I was happy to rest a few days in Toronto, where the recommendations of Mr. Fox [12] assured me a very hospitable reception on the part of Sir George Arthur [13] and the families of the military and civil authorities. I remained only a few days in Kingston, Montreal, and Quebec, and since it was not feasible because of the bad roads to go through the disputed territory to New Brunswick and Maine, I repaired from Montreal via Lake Champlain and the Hudson Canal to New York and thence to Boston. From there I made an excursion to Maine, visited Portland, Augusta on the Kennebec, Bangor, and Penobscot, and eighty miles from the last place, a little Catholic colony, which the bishop of Boston has erected there.

I returned here today from this far journey of no less than 6184 miles; from the attached travel expenses record your Excellency will observe that the cost of transportation amounted to $287.90, that is, between 4 and 5 cents per mile, and, including food and board, the total costs were $790.18.

bishop of Boston (the Rt. Rev. Benedict Fenwick, 1782–1846, bishop of Boston, 1825–1846). He discusses also various difficulties confronting the Catholic clergy and Church in the United States. He expresses his "Besorgnisse" with regard to the establishment of exclusive and isolated Catholic communities whose multiplication he holds "für unmöglich oder wenn möglich keineswegs für wünschenswerth". He concludes: "Im Allgemeinen bin ich der Meinung dass unter den ein Mal gegebenen Verhältnissen dieses Landes der religiöse so wenig wie der nationale Separatismus haltbar und wünschenswerth ist" (*cf.* n. 21, below).

[12] Henry Stephen Fox (1791–1846), minister of Great Britain to the United States, 1835–1846.

[13] Sir George Arthur (1784–1854), lieutenant governor of Upper Canada, 1837–1841.

Enclosed, I have the honor to submit to His Excellency three [further] reports

II, concerning Canada [14]

III, concerning Ohio and the other western states, and

IV, concerning the Catholic colony in Maine, together with a few remarks concerning the condition of the Catholic Church in America.

May Your Excellency accept the expression of my deepest regard

HÜLSEMANN

II

Washington, Sept. 30, 1840.

Monsieur le Baron

Having arrived in Toronto at the moment when a grand meeting of the inhabitants of Upper Canada was about to take place on the heights of Queenstown, I willingly accepted the invitation of the lieutenant governor to accompany him there with a numerous suite of English officers, government employees, and their families. The object of the assemblage was to take the measures necessary to build a new monument in honor of General Brooks,[15] the one which had been placed upon these heights having been recently destroyed by an incendiary, and since this former governor of Upper Canada had met death (in 1812) in these same parts at the head of the militia of the province, just after he had victoriously repelled the invasion of American troops, the mood which prevailed at the assemblage was essentially Britannic, and if not hostile to the United States, at least of protest against everything coming from the other bank of the St. Lawrence. Taking the precaution of attaching myself entirely to the society of the ladies, and having to do with a man as wise and prudent as Sir George Arthur, who occupied the "chair", there was no danger for me of being noticed by the curious, or by two or three Americans, who may have been there, and who in fact could not have deceived themselves as to the attitude of the 5-6000 people assembled. . . .

. . . . There is no doubt that my impression of the English colonies of North America is colored by that scene, and the society in which I passed a week very agreeably at Toronto; and I would not be at all astonished if an American, or anyone else, finding himself placed in reversed circumstance, should report ideas of Canada not at all in line with mine. In Europe, Canada is known, in general, only from news published in the newspapers of New York, and by the famous report of Lord Durham,[16] and I must state frankly, according to what I have seen, and according to the comparisons which I have been in position to make, that these two authorities merit very little confidence. Everything which is published about Canada, whether in the *Herald*, the *Courier* and *Enquirer*, or in the *Globe*,

[14] In French. Hülsemann's other reports are in German.

[15] Hülsemann quite evidently means Sir Isaac Brock (1769–1812), commander of the troops of Upper Canada, and lieutenant governor of Upper Canada, from 1810, killed in the battle of Queenstown Heights, Oct. 13, 1812.

[16] "Report on the Affairs of British North America" submitted to Parliament in 1839, by John George Lambton, first earl of Durham, governor general and lord high commissioner in Canada, 1838 (edited in 3 volumes by Sir C. P. Lucas, Oxford, 1912). Hülsemann, in his report, subjects Durham to severe criticism, speaking of "les absurdes doctrines, en faveur de la responsabilité des conseillers du gouverneur vis-à-vis du parlement colonial".

and even in the *Intelligencer,* is arranged *à l'américaine;* despite protestations to the contrary one finds there always the secret tendency to deny and to cause to vanish the Britannic spirit and the attachment of the inhabitants of (Upper) Canada for England. It is true that the Canadian newspapers reciprocate to their neighbors in emphasizing in their columns every day a collection of all the crimes, horrors, and ridiculous occurrences, true or false, which one so easily finds in glancing through the local papers of the different states of the Union. The *Patriot* of Toronto, and other newspapers of Upper and Lower Canada alike, offer their readers a journalistic continuation of the work of Mrs. Trollope [17] concerning the United States; but these caricatures, despite the amusement which they are able to afford the malevolent, have in fact no more value than the romance of Lord Durham about Canada. I dare not judge his observations concerning Lower Canada, not having had occasion to put them to the test; but I am convinced that those who might take them for a guide in the affairs of Upper Canada would be throwing themselves in an essentially false path, and which could only end in the ruin and the loss of that colony for England.

. . . . But, except that the way of Lord Durham be pursued [18]—which, after the experience of late years, could scarcely be the case, unless a system of treason is followed for a long time—I am not of those who believe Upper Canada would be an easy conquest for the United States. On the contrary, I have the impression that this colony, as constituted at this moment, would have nothing to fear from an American invasion, as the lieutenant governor has at his disposal 4-5000 excellent English troops, 2000 active militiamen, and 17 to 20,000 militia ready to follow the flag . . . . moreover partially armed steamboats. . . . They are evidently much better prepared than in the United States; the English regular troops are infinitely superior to those of the Union—a fact which I have never heard contested by anyone, and which all American officers whom I know admit; also the military spirit, lacking in the Americans except among the inhabitants of the western frontier, who have had to defend themselves against the Indians, is maintained in Upper Canada by the officers of land and sea, and by other officers, who come there to settle. . . .

I was told at Toronto, that if there were only that city and the city of Buffalo in the world, their respective inhabitants would war among themselves to extermination, and it is evident, to whoever journeys on the two banks of the St. Lawrence, that there is a profound aversion between the two nations. The inhabitants of Upper Canada are a more simple and much less noisy class of men, than the Americans; they have good manners, produce wheat and northern fruits in profusion; the homes of the middle classes are often built of stone, while the Americans, having, in their construction, an innate aversion for everything which is solid and durable, almost never use anything except bricks and wood; the peasants and the laborers there [Upper Canada] use wood as in the United States. The cities of Toronto, of Kingston, of Hamilton, and of St. Catharines are growing in population; and Hamilton, being the market for the products of the richest part of Upper Canada, can rival, not Buffalo, but every other city of the American

[17] Frances Milton Trollope (1780–1863) whose *Domestic Manners of the Americans* (London, 1832), was bitterly resented in the United States.

[18] Defined earlier in the document (by Hülsemann) as "préconiser les institutions républicains . . . favoriser individus suspects de républicainisme et de déloyauté", etc.

bank of the St. Lawrence. I have often heard Canadians express their satisfaction on returning home, after crossing the boundary; the "redcoats" evidently put them more at their ease. . . .[19]

The Americans have some good vessels, excellent officers and sailors; but they have no fleet; and the Federal government, unless there occurs a comprehensive change in its form, is much too weak, with the best elements which no doubt would be at its disposal, to effect a considerable armament. Weakened as it is by the anti-patriotic and pernicious doctrine of state rights, the Federal government is incapable of any strong action abroad, and anyone who knows slightly the character of the "politicians" in this land will not doubt the facilities for formidable intrigue, as well in Congress as in the state legislatures, in case of need.

. . . .

I pray Your Excellency accept . . . etc.

HÜLSEMANN

III

Washington, Sept. 30, 1840

Hochwohlgeborener Freiherr,

Among all the northwestern states, Ohio is the richest and mightiest, and the census of this year will apparently give it third place in the Union in respect to population. New York, pre-eminently in possession of the European trade, and Pennsylvania, much richer than Ohio in coal, salt, and iron, have nothing to fear from the former state in regard to commerce and industry; but in agriculture the farmers of the whole interior of Ohio even today are not inferior to these of western New York, or those of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. The soil in the vicinity of Columbus, along the Miami, and in many other sections, is richer than any in eastern Pennsylvania, and the methods of cultivation, compared with the greater extent of the farms, is very careful; I saw not infrequently wheat fields of 100 acres and maize fields of the same size; the homes of the farm owners [are] mostly built of bricks and without luxury, in correct proportion to their independent life, which closely resembles that of the free peasant in the marsh districts of the mouths of the Elbe and the Weser.

The predominance of the farming population is decisive here; the cities, Cincinnati, Cleveland, and a few others of lesser consequence which are new and consequently anything but rich in capital funds, have by no means been able to gain such influence on the administration of the state, as have the banks and capitalists of Philadelphia in eastern Pennsylvania; the public projects, especially the canals in Ohio, have therefore become much less an object of speculation, and the method of their construction has been more according to the actual needs, and has been accomplished with limited means, consequently with no more than the necessary expenses. It is especially

[19] Hülsemann admits the presence of "malcontents" but does not consider them, in respect either to numbers or position, a danger to England's dominion. As to the French Canadians, he thinks they retain "l'aversion qu'ils ont montrés dans les deux guerres . . . pour leurs voisins" [the Americans]. Mareschal, in his above-mentioned report, seems less certain of the continued loyalty of the colonies. After the—according to his view—probable assimilation of the French element, whether the "population homogène des Canadas se trouvera plus, ou moins inclin à suivre l'exemple des États-Unis . . . est une autre question que je ne prétends point décider, mais ce qui me paraît positif c'est que toute Colonie Anglaise porte avec soi le germe d'un démocratie qui tôt ou tard arrive à maturité".

fortunate for Ohio that the legislature was wise enough to limit the building of canals almost wholly to two main lines of communication between the Ohio and Lake Erie, and not, as in Pennsylvania, scatter so much effort in small local canals and railroads, which is there [in Pennsylvania] to be ascribed especially to the very serious abuse of the so-called logrolling system.[20] A principal cause of the wiser conduct of public affairs lies without doubt in the superiority, numerical and at the same time intellectual, in the population of this state of the New England element, whose influence was sufficiently prevalent, at least partially to introduce and adapt the sensible institutions and laws of Massachusetts.

As said, no state of the Union reminded me so much of our districts of northwest Germany as Ohio; the climate too in the north half of this state is similar to that of middle Germany; the southern half, especially the banks of the Ohio are, on the other hand, much warmer. The number of German colonists, from Germany as well as from Pennsylvania, is very considerable; whole counties, especially in the neighborhood of Canton, have preponderantly German populations. New immigrants, by purchase of half cultivated farms at 6-8-10 dollars an acre, with small wood houses, find there a passable means of existence much easier than by purchase of government land at 1 ¼ dollars per acre in Missouri and Illinois, where they are forced to live in the wilderness, and often succumb to unaccustomed difficulties and deprivations. In late years, whole communities of Germans, bringing with them all necessary artisans, have occasionally immigrated to the westernmost states, bought a considerable district of government land, and built villages on the banks of the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Illinois, and other navigable streams. This without doubt makes the first establishment easier for the individual, and has the advantage that they [the communities] bring with them a German clergyman or at least a school teacher, who, as a representative of the intellectual classes, necessarily exercises great influence on the little community. On the other hand, this form of German immigration, which at present is occurring much more frequently than formerly, favors all too much the isolation of the German population, which moreover is becoming daily more pronounced. This tendency was always predominant in Pennsylvania; on the other hand, in the other states, the small number of Germans lost themselves in the mass of Anglo-Americans, and according to all that I have seen till now, this modern tendency of those persons who exercise the greatest influence on the population seems anything but advantageous. The source of this endeavor [community isolation] is no other than the ambition of certain individuals to concentrate in their hands the leadership of an important number of Germans, and to play a political role by disposing of their votes as they wish. They have attained this purpose nearly everywhere, since the German population, by its combined vote is very often able, by adherence to one party or the other, to decide the local elections in certain districts. These individuals, among whom there are as a matter of fact, persons of talent, would like very much to appear to be founding a sort of new Germany in America; I however am by no means of the opinion that it will lead to anything other than, in the best instance, an imitation, which will do anything but honor the old Germany, or in the worse and more likely instance, to

[20] A footnote here discusses the meaning of the word logrolling, tracing its origin to the mutual assistance of pioneers in building their log cabins.

violent and bloody fights with the Anglo-American population. The German immigrants belong, almost without exception, to the lower classes; only in Baltimore, New York, and Philadelphia does one find of late individuals belonging to the mercantile classes, from Bremen and Hamburg; the upper classes never come this far, or an individual is lost in the mass, and there is no difference in his descendants. Even the class of German clergymen, jurists, physicians, music and school teachers is seldom represented among the immigrants by men of distinction. It would therefore probably be much better for the Germans, who choose North America as their new fatherland, to attach themselves more to the institutions here established, and not to court danger by a system of national opposition to the natives, among whom there are without doubt comparatively more men, prosperous, independent, and inspiring confidence, than among the present *German* political leaders of the German population, who consist almost without exception of physicians, school teachers, and journalists. In particular the erection of separate German militia companies in New York City and other places has given occasion to very unpleasant scenes, and I have more than once heard remarks from Anglo-Americans, which witness a very hostile attitude toward this system of isolation. The Germans are quite as industrious as the Americans; they consume, however, much less, and frequently therefore, particularly in the agricultural districts, grow wealthier than their neighbors in ready cash, which they spend unwillingly, and that is one more reason for maintaining the ill will of the natives against the so-called Swiss and Dutchmen, who are always viewed more or less as foreigners.

The German immigrants and the Alsatians moreover in these rural districts are far and away the best class of immigrants; for the few English and Scotch farmers who make up their minds [to settle here] are rare exceptions; and on the other hand the great mass of Irish, with whom the north Atlantic states, above all New York, are flooded, render to be sure as poor and needy day laborers very useful services, especially in the construction of canals and railroads, which never would have been completed without the labor of their hands; but they are generally unruly, wherever they assemble in numbers, frequently given to drink, and since the Whigs as well as the Democrats need their votes to decide elections, the authorities almost never dare to take serious action against the disturbances which they cause. These serious abuses are confined moreover principally to the large cities, such as New York and Philadelphia, and to those districts where, because of canal and railroad construction, masses of Irish laborers are assembled. Where they are *distributed* in the interior of the land, particularly in the agricultural sections, they constitute a useful and forceful element of the population.

(In general, social, national, and religious separatism in this country, and particularly in the newer western states seems to me to be a serious evil, and, on the contrary, a thoroughgoing mixture of the races the best means of assuring the prosperity and inner peace of the population which is being formed. This remark refers less to Ohio, where the inhabitants, on the one hand, principally New Englanders, and on the other hand, Germans, and German Pennsylvanians, have already taken on a distinct character, and the newer arrivals are forced to adapt themselves to the existing conditions. But in the states of Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, and in the territories of Iowa and Wisconsin the process of immigration and clearing of the land is under way, and nothing more ruinous could be imagined than if a hostile attitude between the different elements of the population should arise. The

laws of the public order are weak, their application practically impossible, partly because of the vast extent of the land, and the meagre population in the new states, partly and even more because of the existent democratic institutions. The sole guaranty of domestic peace therefore in these districts is the reciprocal pacific attitude of the inhabitants, the removal of all national and religious separatism, and the dislike of whole classes and districts which it unavoidably produces.)[21] The fertility of the soil, and the great mass of excellent lands in the northwestern states and territories, as well as the comparatively easy communication by means of navigable streams, and the successful activity of the inhabitants are elements of material well-being, which are seldom found together in such measure; and anyone who knows only the Atlantic states of the Union cannot easily imagine the richness of the soil. The products of the lands of the upper Mississippi, of Illinois along the Rock River, etc., are however at this moment still unimportant in comparison with their extent; but their increase, their rapid development is conditioned by the necessity of circumstances, and from year to year the material and political weight of the northwestern agricultural states must increase in the scale of the United States. There can be no reasonable doubt that the material strength of the United States, already considerable, will be equal in twenty years to that of a great European power; but it can at the same time be assumed with certainty, that, if the Union and the present form of government continue that length of time, the conduct of Federal affairs will lie in the hands of the Western states. Only New York and Pennsylvania enjoy the advantage of belonging half to the Atlantic states and half to the West; the same fate which has already overtaken Massachusetts and in fact all New

[21] Hülsemann to Metternich, June 8, 1844, Staatsarchiv, no. 20b, discusses antiforeign political movements. He says: "Il vaut beaucoup mieux qu'en Allemagne on laisse partir tous ceux qui préfèrent les États Unis; mais arrivés ici, qu'ils deviennent Américains, qu'eux-mêmes et leurs enfants apprennent la langue du pays et qu'on ne donne pas, par une organisation separée lieu aux jalousies des 'native Americans' ni prêtent à des démagogues irlandais ou allemands des prétextes pour essayer quelque réaction sur leur ancienne patrie." Hülsemann's dislike of separatism is inspired by a second major consideration. He fears the interest and potential influence and interference of unassimilated groups especially German and Irish, in European politics, in a revolutionary direction. In the later forties, his nervousness regarding the possibility of American interference in European affairs increased. After the accession of the "liberalizing Pope", Pius IX, Hülsemann found it necessary to inform Monseigneur John Hughes (1797–1864, Catholic bishop, from 1850 archbishop of New York), "par une voie discrète" (as he reported to Metternich, *ibid.*, no. 17b, July 26, 1847), that the attitude of Hughes's organ (*The Freemen's Journal and Catholic Register*) toward the annexation of Cracow by Austria seemed to him "très inconvénient". He thought the appointment of Hughes as head of the Catholic clergy in America would be undesirable. In September, 1847 (*ibid.*, no. 24b), he even expressed fear that, on Hughes's appeal, an army of volunteers would be assembled to be sent to Ireland, Canada, or Italy. In such event, "une Proclamation du Président pour les empêcher et pour faire respecter la neutralité des États Unis serait la mesure la plus naturelle à demander"; but such a proclamation would have little effect. The most effective means of restraining Hughes would be an action of the Holy See, distasteful to the Irish clergy in the United States, "p.e. quelque mesure contre l'ordre des Jesuites". From Austria, the American chargé d'affaires, William H. Stiles (1808–1865), reported to Buchanan, July 20, 1846, and Jan., 1847, Vienna's fears of the "spread of our free and liberal principles"(U. S. Legation Archives, Austria, nos. 11 and 14).

England, awaits the other Atlantic states in this respect. Massachusetts combines in itself the largest amount of capital and the greatest intelligence in the Union, and in the first twenty years of peace following the war of independence, the influence of this state on the Union was very important; this period is past and can never return. *Numbers* decide, and the very sons of the states of New England desert the poor soil of the homeland every spring by thousands, to seek for themselves and their progeny a new existence in the prairies of the West. One meets these Yankees everywhere in the West, and one recognizes them very easily by their dominating activity, and their adroitness, which almost always plays into their hands the control of common affairs in the communities where they settle. They bring the laws, customs, and social institutions of New England with them, and plant them in the virgin and rough soil. However the results are not the same, because, beside the New Englanders, many quite different elements of the population gather with them, and exercise a distinctly contrary influence. By their inherent character, democratic institutions are everywhere, as well as here, dependent on certain conditions and where these do not exist, the natural defects of these political circumstances necessarily appear. The democratic principle appears in its most advantageous form in communities of small extent, particularly where the disadvantages in social conditions arising from self-government are tempered by strict morals and usages, and by them the failing [authority] is replaced. All citizens of Massachusetts who are in any measure important know each other personally, they meet each other year in and year out in Boston, the center of the little state in wealth, talents, and knowledge, and between which capital and the rural population there is no hostility, as for example there is in New York and Pennsylvania, but rather a mutual good relationship. Authority indeed is by law dependent on the masses, but due to their very widespread insight and experience they turn over the leadership to a certain number of distinguished and for the most part well-to-do individuals; stern Puritanism, which, though modified, still inspires the great mass of families in Massachusetts, replaces in many cases the action of a powerful authority. Rigid observance of Sunday, unconditional necessity for every individual to join some religious sect, the absolute impossibility for a woman of questionable reputation to live there, and to have any sort of social connection in the higher, middle, or lower classes, the spirit of sensible activity which one finds everywhere, together with customs of living, which, though favorable to every comfort, admit of no luxurious extravagance, the almost total ignorance of card playing, a very general disinclination to the theater—with all that a quiet family life spread over the whole state—make the practical application of democratic principles and their survival not only possible, but actually fully suited to the needs of the New Englanders. That which in Europe is so often called the *gouvernement modèle* is what we see in these small communities in New England, and I am very much inclined to believe that a Federal constitution founded on the same principles for a confederation consisting of the six New England states might be very well adapted. The entire error consists in this, that it has been desired to transfer a constitutional form, which is well fitted to small communities, supported by strict family spirit, to states of great expanse and with a quite disparate population and diverse customs, especially that it was believed possible to erect on such weak foundations the constitution of a great realm such as the United States is by its extent. The inevitable consequence is, as we see, a Federal government, which, the more the land expands [and] the greater the popula-

tion becomes, sees itself forced—now for a number of years—to suspend one after another of its functions, and must cede to the state governments even today a great part of its most indispensable power, and, in the interior of the land, has lost almost all prestige and authority as national government. I will treat again of this fundamental error in the United States in a criticism of the work of Tocqueville,[22] a work which His Excellency Prince von Metternich recommended to me on my departure from Vienna, to which however I prefer not to set my hand, till a longer stay in various parts of this country will enable me to compare the value of the remarks made by this discerning and clever author with the facts.

The emigrants from New England take their laws and usages with them into the West; however they find themselves in a wholly different environment, and the democratic institutions of their home, supported by much looser morals and much weaker social bands, sink in a good many places to a quite lawless condition.[23] If a dubious population gathers together, as for example is the case in the lead district of Galena and Dubuque, everyone must look out for himself; the authority of the laws is nil. Though the same is true wherever the colonists live scattered over the wide prairies, it has less serious results, since there is less occasion in isolated existences to come into contact and still less in conflict with often very distant neighbors; but if a village or a community is principally inhabited by New Englanders, which is frequently the case, for instance in Stephenson, and up the whole Rock River in northern Illinois, one is certain to find a series of well-cultivated farms, mills, and all signs of industrious and discerning inhabitants, who also always erect a church of some denomination and a school. The worst elements in these districts come from the lower Mississippi, from New Orleans and the state of Mississippi, and in this respect the frequent communication by means of steamboats has a very deleterious effect on the moral character of the population of the upper Mississippi. From the river certain places are pointed out to the traveler, which are notorious for the depravity of their inhabitants, and where the municipal authorities and even the judges, chosen by the mass of citizens, and naturally not one whit better than these, are guilty of all sorts of baseness.

Another thoroughly bad element of the population (from which, except the city of Boston, New England is almost free) is the free colored people, who are to be found everywhere in the northwestern states in considerable numbers. Ohio also suffers from this evil, where for example in the capital city Columbus the sixth part of the population is said to consist of free colored people. Unfortunately their number is necessarily increasing, and if ever the emancipation of the slaves takes place, and in whatever manner, all Northern states, whose population is not very dense, will be flooded by them. There are everywhere laws to prohibit or to make as difficult as possible the settlement of colored people, because it is proved by experience that among ten colored families, scarcely one consists of orderly and industrious people, but that the great mass is good for nothing except to form the worst scum of the most execrable rabble, such as is not even found in any European harbor, and which can be seen daily in New York, Philadelphia,

[22] Alexis de Tocqueville, *De la démocratie en Amérique*, published first in 1835.

[23] Mareschal, in his accompanying letter to Metternich, inclines to the opinion that this lawless state of affairs is rather a transition stage through which all states beyond the Alleghenies have passed. The Western frontier, he thinks, is the "refuge habituel et naturel de la partie la plus gangrené de la population des anciennes États".

and Baltimore. But these laws are not enforced, since the fanaticism of the abolitionists protects the Negroes everywhere, and the local and state authorities have not the courage to take action against the wishes of this powerful and closely knit party, which is always in position to wield important influence in the re-election of these officials.

By far the principal wealth of the northwestern states consists in agricultural produce, particularly Turkish corn; also in cattle, though till now, because of lack of capital, much less [than in produce]; and in the southern districts of Ohio, Indiana, and Missouri, in tobacco. Only in Wisconsin is there good wood, suitable for shipbuilding. Despite very defective exploitation the lead mines in the neighborhood of Galena (Illinois) and in the territory of Wisconsin already produce considerable amounts, which will no doubt be increased manifold when experienced mining engineers provided with sufficient capital participate in the labor. The lack of such has prevented the opening of the so-called Iron Mountains in Missouri, though iron ore is mined and worked in this state in a region some distance away.

In the midst of these plentiful elements of material well-being there lies a great, deep, and general—likewise material—evil, not hidden, but unfortunately everywhere visible yet often forgotten by travelers, since they almost always make such journeys in the healthy time of the year, an evil which weighs heavily on those who are destined to live there. The greater part of all these Western states is unhealthy through four to five months, and one rarely finds a settlement in which a considerable portion of the population does not suffer bilious fever and ague every year. This is true even of the greater part of Ohio, where moreover many villages lay claim to be considered as healthy; beyond the state of Ohio, however, I have inquired in at least fifty different smaller and larger settlements, and in not one of them even heard the pretension that it is free of fever and ague. Without doubt, this evil will decrease somewhat with the increase of cultivation, construction of drainage ditches, etc.; but a significant betterment of the climate cannot be expected before the passage of a century. On my return to the Atlantic states, I spoke with an intelligent American physician of much experience concerning the notorious fact that the Americans, especially the women, age much earlier than in Europe, and he cited, besides the greater care of Europeans for their health, as the principle reason: first, the excessively rapid change of the climate, from great heat to considerable coldness; and secondly the great number of neighborhoods in all Southern and Western states, which are covered with miasmata, which directly undermine the health of people living there, and indirectly exercise a most disadvantageous influence on the health of the whole population of the United States by the marriage of so many weakened individuals. The great increase of the population of the new states in the last thirty or forty years and their unfavorable reaction on the inhabitants of the Atlantic states would explain the frequent remark of the native-born that the North Americans of the time of the Revolution and to the end of the last century were a stronger race than their sons and grandsons now living. This weak and ailing condition occasions the frequent use and not infrequent misuse of strong medicaments and quackeries, which in its effects and in itself has become a serious evil to the whole country. The above-mentioned physician added that most people who die in advanced age in America are not born here, but have immigrated in younger years.

May Your Excellency accept . . . etc.,

HÜLSEMANN

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF GENERAL, ANCIENT, AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

The History of Western Civilization. By HARRY ELMER BARNES, Lecturer, New School for Social Research, with the collaboration of HENRY DAVID, Instructor in History, College of the City of New York. Two volumes. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1935. Pp. xxiv, 911; xxiv, 1170. $3.75 each.)

THESE are two very readable volumes. The narrative or argument flows along smoothly, and the reader's thought is led easily and naturally from one topic to another. Both the organization and presentation of subject matter are clear and forceful, and the historical ground is pretty well covered. On the other hand, neither facts nor ideas press on one another's heels so closely as to confuse the average reader.

Among the author's qualifications for his task are courses once offered and syllabi compiled in both intellectual and social history, consulting editorship in a co-operative history of civilization in many volumes, and various previous historical publications of his own. Very wide reading is evidenced in the present work, and great industry is shown in the compilation of the extensive and classified suggestions as to reading which, however, are mainly limited to publications in English, because the author feels that most of his readers "are really at home only in materials written in English" (I, ix). Another prominent feature is the numerous quotations, sometimes at considerable length, from other books and, in the case of recent events or problems, from periodical articles. On the whole these are well chosen, well expressed, and are skillfully woven into the general texture of the work. Some of the quotations from recent speeches and articles, however, seem too popular and ephemeral. So far as subject matter is concerned, a prominent feature is the large amount of space given to social institutions and economic life, rather more than to such manifestations of civilization as art, literature, and science, although these are not neglected. Indeed, this emphasis upon social and economic conditions seems the leading positive achievement of the work, as its chief distinguishing negative contribution is the decrying of religion and supernatural beliefs as superstitious. The descriptions of daily life in the past are sometimes very vivid and amusing, with telling comparisons to the present day. For example, "When a Greek citizen went to the theater he did not go in order to get temporary freedom from conventional moral inhibitions" (I, 243).

The character of these two volumes cannot but be affected by a conviction

of the author which the present reviewer does not share, namely, "that history has no significance except in so far as it enables the reader more intelligently to understand the present" (I, vii). To my mind one might as well contend that one studies a foreign language only in order to speak and read one's native tongue better. Or that one travels abroad only in order to be glad to get home and to enjoy one's own country the more. The result of such an attitude toward history is almost certain to be a lack of sympathy with many phases of the past, a consequent failure really to comprehend them, and an overemphasis upon present "trends". According to this formula, whenever the existing times were dark, disorderly, and unproductive, history would have to be correspondingly limited. For students living in an Age of Pericles it would have to expand greatly again, because there would be so much to understand and explain. No doubt one can go too far in the opposite direction, as was shown in the classical antiquarianism of the so-called Renaissance and early modern times, when the Humanists neglected their immediate medieval background.

At any rate, Dr. Barnes restricts his work on the one hand to Western civilization and then so divides his space that the century or more since the industrial revolution receives as many pages as all previous history, while the brief beginnings of Soviet Russia are treated at greater length than is the rise of human civilization in Egypt through many centuries. However, the chapter on Russia is very interesting, and it should be said that the work is intended as a general introduction to the social sciences as well as a history of civilization, and that this may serve partially to explain the greater length of the second volume. It contains much that is of fresh interest, such as the account of the origins of insurance and of produce and stock exchanges at pp. 69 and 70.

The controversial tone which has marked some of the author's previous writing is largely missing in the present work. When it does crop out, I as often as not find myself in agreement with him—as on the question of Allied war debts to this country. In opposing the "Aryan myth" and the "Nordic myth", however, he seems to come perilously near falling into a cognate error of representing the "round-headed Alpine peoples" as an important and constant racial factor.

A number of inconsistencies annoy the careful reader of these volumes. The author is not always self-consistent, as when a particular statement of fact serves to correct some general assertion. Or we are told (I, 67) that "primitive men also lacked mental discipline through training in logic", yet it is soon added, "Grant him his premises and he could draw logical conclusions from them". Or Dr. Barnes's own utterance does not agree with the authority cited or quoted. Thus at I, 829, H. O. Taylor is quoted, "Between the twelfth and the fourteenth century mediaeval art culminates in styles organic in their growth, and novel and original". But two pages later Dr. Barnes says of "the earliest Renaissance painting", "The early pictures, fol-

lowing Byzantine models, lacked life and background, looking as wooden and lifeless as the materials on which they were painted." Or footnotes, which were presumably supplied by the numerous scholars who were asked to read proofs of various chapters, correct a statement of the text. Thus the word *portolani* is not found in the work's index, and at I, 730–731 the text reads: "Classical knowledge of latitude and longitude had all but faded out and the science of accurate map-making had disappeared". But then in a footnote we read: "The geographical knowledge and technique of medieval Christian scholars were greatly improved in the later Middle Ages as a result of contact with the able geographic works of the Muslims. The nautical charts or *portolani* were more likely to be accurate than the general or *mappamondi* type of map. The portolani dealing with the Mediterranean began to show a considerable degree of accuracy by the thirteenth century."

Such inconsistencies suggest that while the author has read extensively, he has not always done so intensively, or has failed to digest and co-ordinate his divergent materials, or has written too hastily and failed to revise with sufficient care. Again, despite the length of these volumes and their normal fullness of style, some matters are merely mentioned without explanation, and that more than once, as in the case of Joseph Black and latent heat (II, 152 and 271) which still remains latent so far as the reader is concerned, or of no fewer than four allusions to unraveling the "mysteries of the benzene ring" (II, 334, 545, 726, 1045), but for the reader they are never unraveled. A single passage of explanation would be preferable.

The author came forward years ago as one of the advocates of the "New History" and still adheres to the general principles then enunciated. But in his statement of historical facts and consequent interpretation of the course and development of civilization he is not, especially in the ancient and medieval sections, always aware of the latest findings of historical research and shows a tendency to hold old-fashioned views. He does not note the debt of Greek to Babylonian or Chaldean astronomy as brought out in Fotheringham's paper in *The Observatory* for 1928 (LI, 301–315). There is also no echo of the work of Lefevre des Noettes, *L'attelage, le cheval de selle à travers les âges,* published in 1931, which has demonstrated the great revolution wrought in cartage and draught animals and their substitution for human labor as a result of the invention of the modern horse collar and horseshoeing in the Carolingian period and tenth century, and the building from the twelfth century on of roads more adapted to modern vehicular loads and more capable of repair than the once much-vaunted Roman roads. Instead we find Dr. Barnes holding the old view that roads were bad and in disrepair from the decline of Rome until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and enlarging on the "Difficulties in Medieval Travel and Trade" (I, 651–653). Such slurs on medieval science and medicine as the statements that "Biology was based but slightly on practical observation" (I, 730), and that "Surgery was handled mainly by the barbers" (I, 731), might have been

qualified by glancing at "Rufinus: a forgotten botanist of the thirteenth century", in *Isis*, XVIII (1932), 63–76, or Gurlt's *Geschichte der Chirurgie* and certain passages in my *Science and Thought in the Fifteenth Century*. In discussing papermaking nothing is said of the improvements in its manufacture which Blum has shown were introduced in Christian Italy over Muslim Spain.

In general the author is attached to the old view of the Middle Ages as primarily ecclesiastical and blighted by the Church and fails to recognize their inventive capacity and achievement. Despite the communes and universities, the many charters of the fourteenth century asserting long before Rousseau that "Man is born free", he asserts, "Certainly the only development of democracy in social organization in the medieval period occurred in the monastic movement—and this was limited"; and, "Democracy, however, or any strong prophecy of democracy scarcely appeared during the thousand years that followed the collapse of the Western Roman Empire" (II, 486). It might further be questioned whether they ever appeared during the Roman Empire, and whether the abbot was not absolute ruler of his monastery. In still maintaining that the Crusades were very influential for civilization, that there was a Renaissance or intellectual awakening in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which "contributed notably to the rise of individuality" (II, 5 and 486), and in emphasizing the so-called commercial revolution, Dr. Barnes gives, one must admit, a fairly faithful reflection of the present confused and inconsistent state of historical teaching and writing. But he is retelling the old, old story, not writing New History or giving us a new interpretation or synthesis of the unfolding of civilization. He himself, to some extent at least, recognizes this and writes (I, vi), "In the light of rigorous historical logic it would probably have been better to abandon all the old chronological designations, but it has been deemed inexpedient to do so".

Dr. Barnes's accepting the conception of a Renaissance comes especially as a surprise because years ago in reviewing my *History of Medieval Europe* he gently chided me for having made "The Italian Renaissance" the caption of two chapters. His present discussion of it is as unconvincing as most others. On the one hand, he claims for it "the poetic and artistic stimulus from St. Francis", who died early in the scholastic and ecclesiastical thirteenth century. On the other hand, he relegates to his chapter on "Medieval Crime and Punishment" the statement, "In late medieval and early modern times a much more cruel and terrible method of ascertaining guilt was introduced, namely, torture" (I, 773). But chronologically this would seem to belong to the "Renaissance". Or he makes "the association of the cultured as a select and superior class in society" (I, 815) a leading feature of the "Renaissance", yet later in the same chapter quotes Preserved Smith concerning the invention of printing to the effect that "The veil of the temple of religion and of

knowledge was rent in twain, and the arcana of the priest and clerk exposed to the gaze of the people" (I, 842). The old statement is repeated that "The remarkable engineering feat of Brunelleschi (1377–1446) in building the great dome on the Duomo in Florence bridged the hiatus in dome construction between the Roman age and the developed Renaissance architecture" (I, 830), ignoring the dome of the adjacent Baptistery and the fact that the dome of the Cathedral is pointed, develops the principles of the Gothic vault, and was not devised by Brunelleschi, who was simply executing the design originated by a commission of eight in 1367, ten years before he was born!

Columbia University. LYNN THORNDIKE.

The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World. By G. T. GRIFFITH. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. x, 340. $5.50.)

THE present volume is one of the most valuable studies of Hellenistic history that has appeared for some time. The problem of the mercenaries is important not only for military history but for the social organization of the time and cannot be studied properly without taking into consideration a great number of related factors. The author is well aware of this and treats his material with a broad outlook and judicious care. He tries to avoid claiming too much for the mercenaries and particularly attempts to distinguish as sharply as possible between mercenaries and non-mercenaries. This effort has produced some of the most valuable sections of his book.

In the consideration of the number of mercenaries of Alexander, the author has drawn partly on statistics transmitted only by Curtius but argues convincingly for their validity. He concludes that Alexander may have employed as many as 65,000—not to mention others engaged by his governors—but never had many in his field army. Instead he used them in garrisons and as colonists. Pyrrhus, on the other hand, was primarily not a leader of an Epirote national army but of mercenaries. For both the Ptolemaic and Seleucid empires the conclusion is reached that the military settlers, who are not to be regarded as mercenaries, supplied the soldiers of the regular phalanx. In Egypt, the system was a failure, as is shown by the fact that the regular phalanx at Raphia numbered only 5000. This conclusion, based on a correction of the statistics of Polybius and accepted also by Tarn and Cary, is clearly correct. In the Seleucid empire, the cleruch system was more successful, probably, it is suggested, because it was based on the polis. A particularly valuable contribution is the study of the distinction made in the pay of the mercenaries between maintenance and pay proper. In dealing with the rates of pay, the author admits that he is on uncertain ground but makes careful use of the available material. The conclusion is that the wages of soldiers, when compared to "working-class" wages, were not bad. The high pay sometimes assigned to the soldiers of Alexander

is challenged on the ground that it is based on a misinterpretation of the sources.

Naturally in a work so complicated there are points that can be criticized. The Achaeans that served with Philip V and with Eumenes should be classed as allies and not as mercenaries (pp. 180, 246). Thucydides iv. 67.2 is cited on page 87 under the date 425 instead of 424 B. C. The passage supplies no argument for considering the Athenian περίπολοι as "a kind of foreign legion of which the Plataeans were the nucleus". In the first place, it is not clear that the Plataeans were members of the corps in question (*cf.* the edition of Classen-Steup and the translations of Jowett, Crawley, and Smith). In the second place, if the Plataeans were members, this does not prove the presence of foreigners, for the Plataeans had been granted Athenian citizenship (*cf.* Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte,* III, 1038). Griffith proves that the corps contained foreigners in 411, but their employment as early as 424 remains, at best, unproved. The crucial and difficult Coan inscription referred to on page 283 deserves fuller treatment and more exhaustive citation of literature.

The University of Chicago. JAKOB A. O. LARSEN.

The Victoria History of the Counties of England: Rutland. Volume II. Edited by the late WILLIAM PAGE, Hon. D. Litt., F.S.A. (London: Saint Catherine Press. 1935. Pp. xliv, 284. 3 guineas.)

THE second volume of *The History of the County of Rutland* is the first volume of the Victoria histories of the counties of England to be published since the death of the late editor, Dr. William Page, in February, 1934. Dr. Page has been connected with the series almost from its beginning, as joint editor from 1902 to 1904, and as sole editor from 1904 to 1934. The whole of this volume with the exception of the introduction was prepared under his direction; also he wrote some of the articles for it. In recognition of his very able work in editing the histories there is contributed a memorial to him by Sir Charles Peers, and also a bibliography of his own historical works compiled by Miss Agnes E. Roberts.

Rutland is famous chiefly as the smallest of the English counties, and as the only one in the Midlands whose name is not identical with that of the shire town. Its origins are obscure, and even the circumstances of its emergence as a political unit are not definitely known. In Domesday Book the returns for three of the five hundreds that comprise the county today appear under the caption "Roteland" as under a separate heading, following the survey of Nottinghamshire. The two other hundreds were part of Northamptonshire. Only after 1130 was the name "Rutland" used for the whole of the present county, and not until the reign of John does the county appear continuously. The late origin of Rutland, and the natural tendency of its larger neighbors to overshadow it, have made its history uneventful. Impor-

tant families, as for example the Cecils, the Noels, the Harringtons, and the Digbys, at some time held land there, yet few of these names are primarily identified with the county because the main holdings of the families lay elsewhere.

The second volume of the history, the publication of which was made possible by the generosity of Mr. Owen Hugh Smith, maintains the high standard set by its predecessors. It is devoted entirely to topography. In the introduction Miss C. M. Jamison and Mr. F. H. Cheetham review, if briefly, Rutland's history as given in the first volume, showing particularly how this history influenced the architecture of the county. They discuss further the various periods of building and the noteworthy features of each. As is customary in the series, an account of each parish, its manors, churches, advowsons, and charities, is arranged under the appropriate hundred. The small size of the county has made it possible to treat these subjects at greater length than in the volumes devoted to larger and more richly endowed districts. The text is profusely illustrated with photographs, and drawings, plans of churches, manor houses, and old buildings, and also with the coats of arms of families which have held land in Rutland. The wealth of detail concerning manors and their tenants is invaluable to anyone interested in agrarian and local history.

Mount Holyoke College. ELISABETH G. KIMBALL.

Glossary of Mediaeval Terms of Business: Italian Series, 1200–1600. By FLORENCE EDLER, Associate in Research of the Mediaeval Academy of America. (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy. 1934. Pp. xx, 430. $6.00.)

Miss Edler has given us a fairly representative list of Italian medieval business and trade terms with ample illustrative passages. She was faced with the difficult, or rather, impossible task of selecting a small number of important entries out of a huge supply of obviously essential terms, with the result that most of the basic words in the trades of wool, silk, transportation, etc., have been left out.

It might perhaps have been advisable to reduce the number and the length of the illustrative passages; and also to leave out words that are still of common modern usage, of which there are many in this dictionary. But perhaps the best way to approach the problem would be to limit the field and cover each trade completely and minutely. It should then be possible to obtain a thoroughness, a technical competence, and a philological exactness which it would be unfair to demand of the work as it now stands.

A few illustrations of these missing desiderata must suffice. As to definition of words, it is not correct to say that *canepaio* is a worker in hemp and also (with a query) "a journeyman or a small master". We have here two distinct and well-known words; one from *canapa* (hemp), the other

from the Latin *canava* (Ital. *caneva*) meaning "store, cellar", and the like. Nor is there any occasion for a query, for the word *caneparius*, covering a most important occupation in the Middle Ages, has been carefully studied from all angles. Again, *divettare* does not mean "to pick over wool cutting out bits of *skin*". This "skin" is the result of an impossible text emendation whereby Miss Edler would change into *la pelle* the MS. *la ppole*. But the latter is the correct word, *lappole* meaning "little burs", to remove which was the task of the *divettatori*. *Facitrice* is not a female worker. As to the question of philological accuracy, I should remark that *torsello* has nothing to do with *torso* of a statue. It is the same word as *trousseau*. The attempt to introduce Greek words in the text has not proved successful, most of such words being wrong.

The interpretation of the business transaction on page 144 seems incorrect: for *forniscono la detta ciera* cannot possibly mean, as we are told, "take the said wax", but rather "furnish the said wax", and *ho chiesto*, etc., does not mean "I have an order" (which I have to fill for them), but "I have given them an order" (which they have to fill for me). And the whole transaction is presented as an impossible deal of a broker with two buyers and no seller.

Miss Edler tells us in the preface (p. xx) that certain textual corrections of Professor Sapori "have cleared the meaning of several terms which had long been misinterpreted, such as affettatori and affetto, which should be read as assettatori and assetto". I do not know what the reading of the particular text here referred to is, but I think we should hesitate in changing the heretofore accepted term of Calimala and other trades from a*ff*ettatori to a*ss*ettatori. Of course we have here the well-known French, Italian, and Spanish word which, besides meaning general embellishment, is used to indicate particular treatment, such as tanning leather, pressing the tissues of cloth, etc. (see Du Cange, *s.v.* affaitare; and Wartburg, Franz. Etym. Wörterbuch, *s.v.* affactare, "Nuls draps ne devoient estre affettees a molins . . . mais devoient estre affettiez au pie", tom. VII, ord. p. 216; Tobler Lommatzsch, *s.v.* afaitier). In Roquefort we find "affeter = mettre les draps en presse" (quoted by Gherardini, *Voci e Maniere, s.v.*). For the early Italian usage of the word, see Rigutini under affaitare, affettare. This word exists then as a technical term of the woolen industry and it seems, therefore, as though it should be retained in the *Calimala Statutes* (p. 120): "affettatori o rimendatori", and in the *Trattato dell' Arte della Lana* (Doren, Flor. Woll., p. 492): "Poi si mandano al cimatore e cimangli da rovescio o di mezzo affetto o di tutto affetto", and I, 315, "cimator seu affettator". The trouble seems to be that the word has been taken to mean the folding of a piece of cloth (so among others Miss Edler, *s.v.* affettatura), whereas the meaning is entirely different.

Columbia University. DINO BIGONGIARI.

A History of Magic and Experimental Science. By LYNN THORNDIKE, Professor of History, Columbia University. Volumes III and IV, *Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.* [History of Science Society Publications, New Series, IV.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1934. Pp. xxvi, 827; xviii, 767. $10.00.)

THESE volumes arrived for review during the week of Robert Hooke's tercentenary, an auspicious date, for Hooke's diary appearing in print at that time reminds us of the carelessness of science to its own history. It is so much easier to acclaim a "genius" than to analyze the background of a personality or a scientific discovery. In these days when biologists are engaged in erasing eponyms from their science a historical attitude toward the foundations of experimental philosophy seems further off than ever. Hooke's library, which might have explained the man, was distributed at a sale in 1891.

If the unhistorical attitude of modern science is to be amended it will be due largely to the enthusiasm and tireless pertinacity which characterize Professor Thorndike's monumental study, what he himself in loving depreciation calls "sniffing about among the manuscripts and incunabula and university records" to come upon the "scent of some of the leading and distinguishing interests of the time".

Our inquiry into the history of scientific method and philosophy has been barred by what appears to be an extraordinary movement for the cultivation of science in the seventeenth century—that 'Century of Genius'—when the Royal Society was founded and Newton's fame dominated its luster for three hundred yea-s. Surely to learn that Hooke was Boyle's assistant and made his air pumps work throws some suggestive light on the development of Boyle's own law.

In the volume published in 1929 on *Science and Thought in the Fifteenth Century* Professor Thorndike administers a wholesome and moving rebuke to those who extol genius at the expense of knowledge already current and common at the time. That we today are so attached to the farfetched and unnatural as against the simple and direct method is surely due to the survival of superstition and dominance of the occult against which we ourselves delight to rail. We have thought of magic and superstition as forming a great part of the life of primitive peoples and are only now beginning slowly to realize that these beliefs flourish with the growth of culture and permeate the thought of so-called civilized nations much more deeply than they have done in the simpler communities which are passing or have already passed from the stage of history.

Recent writers may not be excused for their misappreciation and acceptance of inadequate evidence, their lack of perspective and of common sense in attributing fundamental significance to the chance phrases of men whose fame was founded upon, and whose time was largely occupied with other pursuits than those of science. But at least it is some explanation of

their error to realize, as one must do in reading these volumes, how little chance those of us who are not steeped in the history of philosophy have hitherto had of knowing anything of the scientific knowledge open to and shared in some sense by those whose names have been accorded greatness in medieval times. Even Thorndike himself, at the conclusion of Volume II, expressed the belief that the medieval revival of learning seemed to have spent its force by the first quarter of the fourteenth century with Peter of Abano as its last great figure, although he did close with the suggestion of at least an interesting study in exploring the little understood period between these great days and that seventeenth century of which I have already spoken when Sir Thomas Browne's *History of Vulgar Errors* exposed the barrenness of pseudoscience. The appearance of these two huge volumes makes ample amends for his premature conclusion. But if a master of history can thus fail to appreciate the true worth of two centuries of thought until he has explored them with all the erudition and facilities at his command we amateurs may be forgiven for our failure.

Not only has Professor Thorndike found out that writers on occult subjects during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries have much to say but also that the germs of later scientific discoveries are already found in the writings of the two centuries which form the glory of this work. More materials have been to hand than Thorndike himself expected so that, huge as they are, the volumes, he says, are not an exhaustive cataloguing but a selection of representative men and writings to illustrate with substantial justice the rich remains of the period. The author's own summary includes stress on means, on proportion, and on extremes; the intension and remission of forms; the rotation of elements; the configuration of qualities; the putting of subtle questions and elaborate discussion of *dubia;* the clinical study and recording of medical and surgical cases; the criticism of past authorities and the effort to evolve new theories and improved terminology; the development of scientific tables and instruments; the application of dialectical skill and precision to natural problems; and the strengthening of natural philosophy by mathematical method and mechanical ingenuity. The range extends from the extreme of popular superstition to rational skepticism and sound weighing of the credibility of evidence.

It was quite natural that astrology should command attention before alchemy for, as Sir Arthur Eddington has explained, the internal combustion of a star is easier to understand than that of a piece of iron. Indeed the sections dealing with alchemy are the most difficult to grasp, for the author is not at pains to expound the alchemical figures of speech and they are strange phrases in our ear today as perhaps our figures and metaphors in electricity may sound strange to scientists of the future. Here is the beginning of quantitative chemistry and, in surface tension, of physical chemistry. But the range is great. Significant contributions are made in chemistry, physics,

geography, economics, medicine, biology, and mathematics as well as in theology, metaphysics, humanism, scholasticism, and necromancy.

It is not, as Professor Thorndike insists, primarily for their contribution to modern methodology and science that he sets forth his researches on the writings of these two centuries, but rather for what they are in their totality, a chapter in the history of human thought. He would not credit them with the least particle of modern science which does not properly belong to them nor deprive them of any of that magic which constitutes in no small measure their peculiar charm.

It is not for the present reviewer to dissect or discuss in detail the contribution of these centuries to the sum total of human knowledge as set forth by a master of historical method. But as a humble journeyman in this field of study he may add his grateful testimony to the immense value of these researches in bringing within our grasp an understanding of the themes and discoveries for which, all unknowing, we are indebted to those who helped to turn the trackways of science into the broad highways of today; and to place for us in proper perspective among their peers and superiors those who in earlier centuries were wont to snatch their doctrines in happy guesses from the scientific culture of the time.

Western Reserve University. T. Wingate Todd.

Parliamentary Taxes on Personal Property, 1290 to 1334: a Study in Mediaeval English Financial Administration. By James Field Willard, Professor of History, University of Colorado. (Cambridge: The Mediaeval Academy of America. 1934. Pp. xii, 357. $8.00.)

It is sad that Professor Willard's death should have followed so soon upon the appearance of this monument to his scholarship. His fellow scholars will, apart from the personal loss, deeply regret that so comprehensive and detailed a knowledge of early English taxation should not illuminate its further development. The period which he wisely selected for full description in this volume began at the time when the exchequer took over the administration of the taxes on movables and ended with the year when they were so crystallized that henceforth they were granted as a fifteenth on movables in rural districts and a tenth on movables in towns or on ancient demesne, every contributing unit paying, unless especially exempt, a fixed sum. Between 1290 and 1334 the fractions had been variable and the returns dependent upon assessments made after each grant. The work continues Professor Mitchell's studies of similar taxes under John and Henry; and it is complementary to Professor Lunt's extended examination of contemporary taxation of the clergy and, at farther remove, to Professor Gras's account of the origin of the customs.

It is primarily an administrative study; and seldom has one relating to early English history been made with more care, logic, and lucidity. Although

the composition of the assemblies which granted the taxes on movables is treated briefly, the number and purpose of the grants, the appointment of and the instructions to taxers and collectors, the mechanism and records of the assessment, the collection of and the drafts upon the proceeds of the tax, the stages in the accounting at the lower and at the upper exchequer are described in exhaustive detail. We follow everything that might happen to a chief taxer or his subordinates from the moment of appointment to that of discharge. A few of the author's conclusions may be briefly noted.

In the first place Professor Willard usually avoids calling these taxes lay subsidies, the term under which the records of them have been classified at the Record Office. In contemporary usage a subsidy meant something else, either a tax on exports and imports or, in the fifteenth century, a tax on incomes. Of the seventeen taxes on movables levied between 1290 and 1334 all but two were granted for purposes of war or defense. Several were approved after the king had agreed to remedy abuses but only two were not collectible until he had done so. The records are county rolls and local rolls, the former recounting names of property owners and the tax due from each, the latter giving also a full description of the property taxed. Of the local rolls there are preserved only such as were called into the exchequer for special examination and not later destroyed or, now and then, something surviving locally as at Shrewsbury or on the manor of Cuxham. Powell published a valuable summary of a local roll in *A Suffolk Hundred in the Year 1283*.

The chief taxers, who were also the collectors, appointed the subtaxers, likewise collectors, for local units. Men so designated could escape service only under penalty. They were supposed to receive no wages other than an undervaluation of their own movables and their expenses, which, relatively small, were deducted from the tax. Against them many charges of corruption were brought, notable for "concealment", *i.e.*, reporting smaller sums than they collected. In 1294 the Somerset collectors were accused of retaining £393 while accounting for £2072, and a subcollector might conceal as much as £6. Another malpractice was the acceptance of money for "admitting the taxation", *i.e.*, approving a modified assessment. Professor Willard conjectures that small sums so received may have been little more than customary fees, often given to administrators.

As to the assessment itself, were the movables valued at market prices or was there a conventional valuation? The latter, concludes the author, making a comparison of assessed values with prices for the same localities as ascertained by Rogers and Beveridge. And were all supplies of grain taxed? Pointing out that the amounts usually taxed could not have supported the population of the locality in question, Professor Willard surmises that sustenance grains escaped taxation, only grain for sale being rated. Lastly, if a man had movables worth less than a certain amount, often ten shillings, he paid no tax. The three practices—conventional valuation, disregard of grains

not for sale, and neglect of movables below a ten-shilling total—brought it about that many owners of movables escaped taxation altogether. From this it follows that the tax lists have little value for ascertaining population. The population of certain localities, known from other sources, diverged widely from the figures of the lists. In Leicester, *e.g.*, a local tallage of 1286 noted 408 contributors and one of 1307, 278; but for the fifteenth of 1307, 190 persons were taxed, for the twentieth of 1327, 105, and for the tenth of 1332 only 73. The county rolls, therefore, give little information touching the actual population of England.

By ending his study at 1334 Professor Willard does not tell us about one matter important for the future. In 1334 the method of local assessment was changed. Owing to complaints of corruption in 1332 the chief taxers were directed to negotiate with men of the various vills and towns and to accept the amount which each agreed that it could pay, provided that this was not less than had been paid in 1332. Usually more was got. But we do not learn how the locality itself determined what it should pay or how the amount was apportioned. There should have been a higher degree of local initiative than formerly, when the chief taxers designated a small number of men in the vill or town to do the assessing.

The gathering in of the tax leads the author to a valuable description of exchequer procedure and of the records which attended it. The account of "drafts" on the revenues, usually authorized by writ of the exchequer itself but sometimes by writ under the great seal or the privy seal, illuminates the development of tallies. Originally issued by the lower exchequer to a collector to be taken to the upper exchequer, a tally came to be, through a clever device of the early fourteenth century, given to a creditor along with the writ which ordered the collector to pay him money and was by him turned over to the collector as a receipt, the latter in due course bringing the tally to the exchequer as evidence of money paid out. Though Mr. Jenkinson has argued for the negotiability of tallies, Professor Willard found no evidence of it in the period under survey.

Only a few of the outstanding discussions of this definitive work have been noted. Students of administrative and social history will find within its covers much to enlighten them further.

Bryn Mawr College. H. L. Gray.

BOOKS OF MODERN HISTORY

Les origines de la Réforme. Par P. Imbart de la Tour, membre de l'Institut. Tome IV, *Calvin et l'Institution chrétienne.* (Paris: Firmin-Didot. 1935. Pp. xiii, 506. 25 fr.)

When Imbart de la Tour succumbed to an attack of angina pectoris on the eighteenth of December, 1925, he left his masterpiece unfinished. *Les*

origines de la Réforme was planned in five volumes, of which the first, *La France moderne,* appeared in 1905, the second, *L'Église catholique: La crise de la Renaissance,* in 1909, and the third, *L'Évangelisme,* in 1914.

Interruptions due first to war work and then to the production of a volume on medieval France prevented the continuation of *Les origines* for a long time. Now at last, with the help of many other scholars, M. Jacques Chevalier has been able to give to the public the fourth volume of the great work, which volume was left nearly completed at the time of the author's death. The last chapter has been given only in outline, and many chapters lack notes referring to authorities. But the text is as readable, as carefully finished, and as solid as is anything that ever came from the author's pen.

The new book takes up the story in 1538, at the point when the impact of Calvinism began to be felt. The first third of the work paints a lifelike portrait of Calvin's mind and exhibits his doctrine and public career. Judicious rather than brilliant, learned rather than original, impartial and yet critical, the author has achieved a sober and profound study of a great man. Characteristically averse to paradox, Imbart de la Tour barely touches upon the theme of "Calvinism and Capitalism", which, since Max Weber's path-breaking essay on that subject, has usurped the first place in almost all studies of the Reformer. But the author's saturation in his subject amounts to genius.

Newer to the student of the period will be the second and third parts of the volume under review, the second describing the classes to whom and the means by which the Protestant doctrine was preached and the methods of repression, the third displaying the state of France during the reign of Henri II, and the birth of the Protestant party.

So smoothly does the story read, so logically does each event follow the last, that the very perfection of the author's argument almost arouses a suspicion of its fidelity to fact. Is the history which no one can predict for the future, really so schematic that anyone can perceive its rational progress in the past? Can the perception of trends and the study of causes ever lead to the formulation of general laws of development? Our study of bygone ages seems to contradict our living experience of the present.

Nevertheless, the author's final conclusion is one from which it is hard for the historian to escape. "If", he tells us, "Protestantism failed to conquer France, that was due neither to accident nor to brutal repression by force, but to profound causes arising in our genius and history."

The critic who would find fault with any part of this great work will do so at his peril. To correct it, to amplify it, to improve it would take a lifetime of arduous study. To learn from it and to profit by it is happily within the power of every reader.

Cornell University. PRESERVED SMITH.

Thomas More. By R. W. CHAMBERS, Quain Professor of English in

University College, London. (New York: Harcourt Brace and Company. 1935. Pp. 416. $3.75.)

STUDENTS of Sir Thomas More have had reason in the past to be grateful to Professor Chambers for many blessings. His brilliant lecture on the Saga and Myth of Sir Thomas More before the British Academy in 1927, his notable work in collaboration with Miss Hitchcock on the learned edition of Harpsfield's life of More for the Early English Text Society, and with his colleague Professor A. W. Reed on the new edition of More's English works now in progress, have established his position as an authority on the life and writings of More beyond question. What is even more to the point, they have made it quite clear that he not only understands More, but loves him. Much, therefore, in the way of a biography of More was to be expected of Professor Chambers, particularly in this year 1935, which marks both the four hundredth anniversary of More's death and his canonization by the Roman Church. And much has been vouchsafed. This is one of those rare books which present the choicest fruits of ripe scholarship in fine, eloquent, and witty English prose—apples of gold in pictures of silver.

Professor Chambers is not of the faith for which More suffered (p. 15), but Roman Catholics need have no fear that their new-made saint has been approached in anything but the most sympathetic and reverend of spirits. Indeed, if the book has a fault it is that More is presented too spotlessly. Professor Chambers himself complains that the atmosphere of blamelessness around his hero is one of the most difficult problems with which he has had to cope (p. 104). Contemporary testimony is unanimous in More's praise on all points. To those immediately about him he was little short of divine. His son-in-law wrote a short life of him which has been justly described as "the most perfect little biography in the English language", and his friends and servants after his death gathered together all the tales about him with the reverend care of those collecting the relics of a holy martyr. Erasmus spoke of him as one "whose soul was more pure than any snow, whose genius was such as England never had,—yea, and never shall have again, mother of good wits though England be" (p. 73). Even Elizabethan London, notwithstanding its abhorrence of all things papistical, remembered him as the "best friend that the poor e'er had" (p. 47). Professor Chambers has not only accepted this contemporary estimate, but has laid lance in rest against every modern historian who has ventured to question it. He adds a few facts, but what he adds serves merely to substantiate the image of More which William Roper drew for us almost four centuries ago.

If there is any one single theme running through the book it is that More belonged rather with the Middle Ages than with the moderns and that his life was directed by one increasing purpose throughout. What has troubled many of More's biographers has been the apparent inconsistency between the tolerant religious attitude which he took in his *Utopia* and the intolerant

religious attitude which he revealed later in his attack upon Tyndale and the Protestants. Professor Chambers insists that the inconsistency is of the critic's own making and is based upon a fundamental misunderstanding of *Utopia*. His argument deserves careful consideration and invites a reappraisal of *Utopia* less in the light of what it foreshadowed for the future than of what it transmitted from the past. Nevertheless, it is hard to believe that More could have written *Utopia* after the Lutheran revolt and impossible to believe that when the issue between reformer and revolutionary was definitely joined he did not, like his friend Erasmus, lose a great deal of his sweet reasonableness in the heat of the fight.

Not many critics, Catholic or Protestant, will quarrel with Professor Chambers's estimate of More. He is, after all, the common heritage of Englishmen of all creeds, a glorious figure by any reckoning. If he died for his faith, in still a broader sense he died for "the right of the free man not to be compelled to say that which he does not believe" (p. 366). But Professor Chambers is rather less than fair to More's executioner. Henry VIII is the villain of the piece. We are asked to believe that Henry "destroyed more things of beauty, and more things of promise, than any other man in European history" (p. 107). We are asked to believe that he left England poor (p. 377), that he "killed laughter" (p. 382), and that his reign "marks a distinct set-back" in practically every department of English life (p. 382). Those of us who find some merit in the development of English parliamentary institutions and who ascribe some blessings to the Protestant Reformation will beg leave to differ at this point. It is a pity that Professor Chambers, who proclaims his colleague Professor Pollard to be the "greatest living student of the period" (p. 22), did not consider Professor Pollard's estimate of Henry before consigning him to the uttermost hell.

But after all Professor Chambers was not writing Henry's biography and we need not attach too much importance to his obiter dicta on that thorny subject. In any case, here is a great book, scholarly and delightful, written with a vividness which makes More and his daughter Meg and his son Roper and Dame Alice, his shrewish wife, and all his household live again as they live in Holbein's drawings and in Roper's pages. It is a book not to be borrowed but to be owned. And thanks are due to the publishers for presenting it in such an attractive format.

The University of Pennsylvania. CONYERS READ.

Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England. By LOUIS B. WRIGHT. [Huntington Library Publications.] (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1935. Pp. x, 733. $5.00.)

MR. Wright had unusual opportunities to gather this abundant harvest from the fields of Elizabethan literature. The support for a season offered to young scholars by the Guggenheim Foundation was followed by an ap-

pointment at the Huntington Library. He has made good use of his opportunities. Not only has he exploited the inexhaustible libraries of England but, like others, has discovered how rich in unexpected material is the library at San Marino. The astonishing fecundity of English writers from the middle of the sixteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth has seldom been brought so clearly to light as in this volume of seven hundred pages. A rough count shows mention of some eight hundred essays, comedies and tragedies, published sermons, books of advice in prose and verse, descriptions of beasts, birds, and fishes, narratives of travel, satires, ephemeral pamphlets and ballads, textbooks, histories, moral tales, handbooks to self-improvement, "guides to godliness", and a score of other forms of exuberant production of the busy presses of London in that period. Besides, Mr. Wright's intention is only to include those publications which throw light on the culture of the middle class. Presumably there was a mass of other writing, appealing to or reflecting the interests of the upper class which he has no occasion to mention in his book.

With this thesis of the author we are not quite satisfied. His intention is to probe the "mind of the middle class", to show the literary productions that conciliated the interest and influenced the thinking of this group. For this purpose, in a series of fifteen or sixteen chapters, some of which have been previously published as separate essays, he endeavors to distinguish the middle class from the titled and untitled gentry above them and the illiterate industrial and rural laborers below them, and to discover from the writing of the time the characteristic "ideology" of the middle class. This conception he keeps before himself and his readers by reiteration of such phrases as "middle class taste", "middle class readers", "bourgeois criterions of judgment", "middle class treatises", "the learning of bourgeois women", "burgher morality", and other expressions suggesting that people of the middle class read and wrote different books, thought different thoughts, and were governed by different motives from those of the landed aristocracy. But phrases are not arguments, and we do not perceive that he has proved his case. There emerges from his abundant and detailed descriptions, quotations, and references no clear-cut picture of a "middle class" group of intellectual interests or state of mind. His argument oscillates between proof drawn from the literature written for the middle classes and literature written by them. When writings are quoted as illustrative of middle class culture the proof sometimes rests on their subject, sometimes on their authorship; sometimes on their popularity in bourgeois circles, sometimes on their emanation from bourgeois writers.

The author's own classification often deserts him. He acknowledges that books of devotion and manuals of medicine were read by "women of all classes, aristocrats and commoners alike"; that books of an undoubtedly general appeal were sometimes dedicated to the "gentlewomen of England".

Even "the way to breed a Gentleman's Daughter", seems from internal evidence to refer to general parental duty.

The fact is the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are too late a period in which to distinguish those who read and wrote general literature into intellectual strata. *Macbeth* was directed both to the boxes and the pit, the *Voyages* appealed to both the noble and the citizen; the readers of the chronicles and those who sought instruction for modern times in histories were thoughtful souls who might come from any class in society that knew how to read. Even the penny and halfpenny ballads hawked around the streets or known by heart ran the whole gamut of use from high society down to those lower than the author would admit even to his middle class.

Nevertheless, the book is one of great suggestiveness. If the author will allow us to consider his assumption of there being a class culture merely as a device for penetrating the rich storehouse of general Elizabethan literature by a somewhat more humble entrance than usual, we shall be thankful and admire and enjoy the wealth and variety of its contents. Each of these chapters gives a striking and often a quite new impression, always justified by a wealth of examples. Indeed to one looking at the book from a historical point of view there is an embarrassment of riches. No historical account of a period from which many memorials remain can use them all. There must be enough quoted to explain the course of events, not a record made of every event. However this book should not be looked on as a history. It treats a whole century as a unit, illustrative quotations being taken early or late, from Harrison in 1577 to Peacham in 1638 and back again to a Thomas Underdowne who about 1569 wrote *An Aethiopian History* the popularity of which was as great as a work on the same subject might be just now. The Renaissance, an elusive term at best, is considered as lasting a century or more, and treated as a whole, whereas the very essential of history is continuity, development followed from day to day, from year to year, if possible, certainly watchful of the entrance of every new influence.

This is not to depreciate the book; with published literature alone as its source it may well be that no greater historical continuity is attainable or desirable. As a body of material of great extent, variety, and interest, appearing through a considerable period of great intellectual activity, classified with skill and accompanied with vivacious, discriminating, and thoughtful comment, it must impress every reader with its value. It will be of the greatest value to a writer of the history of that period.

The University of Pennsylvania. E. P. Cheyney.

A Bibliography of British History, 1700–1715, with Special Reference to the Reign of Queen Anne. By William Thomas Morgan, Professor of European History, Indiana University. Volume I, *1700–1707*. (Bloomington: Indiana University. 1934. Pp. xvii, 524. $4.00.)

THERE is to be precious little excuse for those who would study British history in Queen Anne's reign, and know not where to find it. Professor Morgan's work, of which this portly volume is but the first with three or more to come, is planned to cover with substantial thoroughness the sixteen magnificent years of England's rise to first place among the powers of Europe. "With a few exceptions", Professor Morgan informs his readers, "all the more important libraries and archival collections have been drawn upon in America, and in Central and Western Europe" (p. v). One can readily imagine the formidable toil involved in such researches, although the yield of Continental libraries and archives has been disappointing. Professor Morgan warns us that completeness is unattainable: "The present bibliography is confessedly weak in a number of particulars. Ireland, Scotland, and Wales are little worlds of their own, and have been dealt with somewhat incidentally. . . . No attempt has been made to provide a bibliography for the British Empire of the period, as that would take us too far afield. . . . The enormously significant religious history . . . has been somewhat neglected, but by no means ignored . . . the history of science . . . has received less space than its importance would warrant. . . . Local history, genealogy, and heraldry have been almost entirely neglected, as belonging in fields rather peculiarly their own" (pp. xi,xii). This first volume, after some thirty valuable pages dealing with bibliographical aids, and a list of works published before 1700 whose influence carried over into the eighteenth century, is entirely devoted to pamphlets and memoirs published in the years 1700–1707 inclusive. One notes that Professor Morgan has used the word "memoirs" to include all contemporaneous materials not classified as pamphlets, correspondence, autobiographies, diaries, journals, or plays. Thus we find Pufendorf's folio treatise *Of the Law of Nature and Nations* entered in this volume. The publications of each year constitute a section. In each section items are recorded under surnames of authors, with cross references under the titles. Could they have been classified according to subject matter both bibliographer and historian would be happier, but one must concede the practical difficulties of classification. The chronological arrangement is open to the objection that unless the user of this bibliography knows the publication date of the work for which he searches, he will be long in finding it, at least until a comprehensive index to the entire bibliography appears. Works of Defoe are found in nine of the ten sections in this volume, the bibliographies dealing with them in the tenth. One may expect more of him in the next volume. For each section Professor Morgan has provided a brief, pertinent introduction. For each item, in addition to author, title, place, date, printer, format, the earlier and more significant editions, and, in the case of the briefer tracts, number of pages, Professor Morgan frequently supplies a line indicating the bearing or importance of the work. When the item has had a perplexing or disputed history, there is a helpful discussion of the problem.

In the space accorded to this review it is impossible to enter upon detailed criticism, and perhaps this is as well since the proof of a bibliography is in the using. We shall realize the full serviceableness of this work only when it has been well thumbed, and when its companion volumes are in print. But it is not too early to recognize that Professor Morgan's scholarly labors have made smooth the path for scholars to come.

Vassar College. VIOLET BARBOUR.

Mercantilism. By ELI F. HECKSCHER. Authorized translation by Mendel Shapiro. Two volumes. (London: George Allen and Unwin; New York: Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. 472; 419. $15.00.)

DR. Heckscher, whose academic career as student and teacher has been confined to Swedish institutions, has been since 1929 the head of the Institute of Economic History and Research Professor of Economic History at Stockholm. The present work was published in Swedish in 1931, appeared in a German translation the next year, and is now (1935) presented to English readers.

Mercantilism, in the sense employed by the author, is the economic policy of the European states, from the end of the Middle Ages down to the age of *laissez faire*. Even when restricted in field to Northwestern Europe the subject is obviously immense. The author disclaims the intention of writing constitutional history or the history of economic organization, but he cannot avoid consideration of administration, the means by which policy was realized, and he is not afraid to offer facts to justify his conclusions on the success of policy. Further, he aims to analyze the ideas which underlay the practice of policy, to trace their development and to show their connection with the economic doctrines of earlier and later times. It is a great subject; and it is a great book. One is tempted to compare it, in spite of differences in subject and plan, with Sombart's *Modern Capitalism*. The author resembles Sombart in the extraordinary range of his material, but he has a more serious sense of responsibility in sifting his material, and his book is much better history. If the reader misses some of the brilliance of Sombart's generalization, and his pungency of expression, and if he becomes sometimes a little weary in following the meticulous analysis, he feels at least he has a safer if (or because) a more sober guide.

The first volume covers "Mercantilism as a Unifying System". One important aspect of mercantilism was the substitution of the state for other groups in the control of economic affairs. Under this head the author discusses three major topics: internal trade and particularly the toll system (pp. 45–127); the regulation of industry in France and England (pp. 137–325); foreign trade and business organization (pp. 326–455). Necessarily the author draws largely on secondary sources, but almost everywhere he checks and illustrates by reference to contemporary material. The greatest

service which he renders students of the subjects treated is the comparison of policy in different countries and at different times, in a determined effort to explain as well as describe. The Industrial Revolution lies, of course, at the boundary of his subject, but it is interesting to note his conclusion that "even in England industrialization at the outbreak of the French Revolution had hardly emerged from its chrysalis stage", and to trace in the period of mercantilism the political and social influences which conditioned the economic revolution to come. This volume is largely matter of fact. It makes substantial contributions and presents few difficulties to the old-fashioned student of history.

The student must prepare himself for a different atmosphere in Volume II. Here he will be invited to leave the world of fact for extended excursions in the world of thought. This part of the work is largely a history of economic doctrine, and a reader not versed in economic theory may perhaps be bewildered. If he has been puzzled by the application of the theory of intermittent free goods to medieval tolls, he may be dismayed when he is invited to note the fallacy of the theory of purchasing power parity as applied to foreign trade. With this warning as an introduction the contents of Volume II may be summarized by listing the aspects of mercantilism treated in it: as a system of power (pp. 13–52); as a system of protection (pp. 53–174); as a monetary system (pp. 175–268); as a conception of society (pp. 269–324). The aim of mercantilism as a policy of power has, of course, frequently been stressed. It is illustrated here with some interesting corollaries derived from the fact that it could be satisfied by the weakening of rivals as well as by the strengthening of the state in question. More extended is the treatment of protection, divided into three heads: staple policy, in the interest of the merchant; policy of provision, designed to make goods cheap and abundant to the consumer; policy of protection, the gospel of dear goods, in the interest of the producer. The author makes an interesting and important contribution in tracing the "fear of goods" to the establishment of a money economy, when sales became of vital importance, in showing its application to theories of employment, of money and of trade, finally, in his conclusion, in showing how this "fear of goods", so strong at the present time, can theoretically be justified. The part on money might seem brief, so much has that subject been emphasized in discussions of mercantilism, but it is so interconnected with other parts as to seem here an adequate part of the whole. Here and throughout the book the author shows a readiness to accept facts and theories as he finds them—a virtue which cannot be taken for granted, as is evidenced by other writings on this very subject of mercantilism, in regard to the relation of wealth and money, for example. Often enough he finds writers expressing ideas which are definitely contradictory, and some of his nicest work consists in the analysis of these contradictions, to discover whether they were simply logical inconsistencies, were motivated by political

expediency, or represented a wavering between alternative points of view. He is, of course, completely opposed to the materialist interpretation. In the rise of protectionism, for example, he concedes but slight influence to the play of class interests; "the principal explanation is to be found in the access to popularity of new economic conceptions, not in a new distribution of power". He thinks Ashley worked on wrong lines in basing the origin of free trade on partisan politics. If he goes too far in separating ideas from facts the exaggeration of the psychical element will, in the opinion of the reviewer, be merely a wholesome corrective to the tendency of many writers on economic history.

It is the author's capacity to treat mercantilism not from one angle but from several, to view it in its entirety, which distinguishes and vitalizes his work, and which lends particular interest to the concluding chapters. In them he discusses the elements of agreement and of contrast between mercantilism and *laissez faire*, the mercantilist conception of society (freedom and trade, ethics and religion, social causation), and the relations of mercantilism to liberalism, nationalism, and humanitarianism.

The English translation, made mainly from the German but revised by the author, is in general acceptable, and an elaborate index of nearly eighty pages enhances the practical value of the book.

Yale University. CLIVE DAY.

Politische Correspondenz Friedrich's des Grossen. Bearbeitet von Professor Dr. GUSTAV BERTHOLD VOLZ. Band XLIV, *Januar 1780 bis Oktober 1780.* [Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften.] (Oldenburg i. O.: Gerhard Stalling. 1935. Pp. 609. 53.90 M.)

WITH this volume, the impressive publication of the diplomatic correspondence of Frederick the Great of Prussia, already in progress for considerably more than half a century, enters upon its last stage, the period from the Peace of Teschen to the death of the monarch in 1786. Its editor sustains the same high level of editorial workmanship characteristic of the previous volumes. There are the same copious footnotes and cross references, the same elaborate indexes and exhaustive table of contents. In this volume, as in those immediately preceding it, the editor has printed either the text or a summary of the reports of the Prussian ambassadors at foreign courts to which Frederick's letters constitute a reply, a practice which adds greatly to its utility and distinguishes it from the earlier volumes of the publication.

The period covered by the present volume extends from January to October, 1780, and is comparatively quiescent. The king has grown old and pacific, for, as he confesses, "age extinguishes the fires of youth and we have the vanity to call reason what is merely an enfeeblement of the senses and faculties of the mind" (p. 433). Yet this correspondence remains a fascinating record of his alert and sober political intelligence. It is equally

interesting as a running commentary on European affairs and as a record of Prussian policy. He is constantly operating with what he calls a "pronostic", a tentative judgment on the state of affairs which he revises from day to day as more complete reports pour in to his royal cabinet.

In the war of American Independence Frederick's position was determined by his Continental situation which, based on his somewhat uncertain alliance with Russia, required a friendly co-operation with France as the only means of restraining the expansionist tendencies of Austria. As these letters indicate, his sympathies were for the moment with the French and the revolting American colonies. He ardently hoped that France would take advantage of this brilliant opportunity to recover maritime ascendancy from "Jacques Roast Beef", the "insular brigands", as he called the British. But he had no confidence in the wisdom of French naval operations and feared that "la science navale est sans doute pour les Anglais". The real fault, it is interesting to note, he thought lay with the French naval commanders who were not taken as they should have been from the experienced sailors of St. Malo and other French ports (pp. 58, 108). He applauded Catherine II's "Declaration" on the freedom of neutral commerce, supported her efforts to form the League of Armed Neutrality, by encouraging Holland and Denmark to join, and declared his own willingness to participate, provided that doing so would involve no pecuniary outlay.

But the pivot around which his foreign policy turned during these months was his opposition to the extension of Austrian influence in Poland, Germany, and the Ottoman Empire. Austria, during the illness of Maria Theresa, had come wholly under the control of the "infant" Emperor Joseph II of whose statesmanship Frederick held no very exalted opinion. Most of the letters of this volume are concerned with two events, the meeting of Catherine II and Joseph II at Mohilev and the election of the Austrian archduke Maximilian as coadjutor by the cathedral chapters of Cologne and Münster. He opposed the latter on the ground that the election of a Hapsburg would upset the balance of Germany and give Austria an overwhelming preponderance in the affairs of the Empire (p. 285). His failure to prevent this election, he attributed to the complaisance of France for her Austrian ally and to the vastly greater favors which Austria was in a position to bestow on the canons of the two chapters. When his ministers informed him that only a war could thwart the election of the Austrian archduke, Frederick replied that he could wage no war, for "I have no ally" (p. 331). His only security at this time lay in his alliance with Russia, which during these very months was being seriously threatened when Catherine II and Joseph II met at Mohilev. He did not learn the full import of this meeting, which aimed at paving the way for the expulsion of the Ottomans from European Turkey, until many months later. As long as Count Panin was in charge of Russian foreign affairs he was reasonably certain of his Russian alliance, but the Austrian

leanings of Prince Potempkin, who still retained his ascendancy over the mind of Catherine II, worried him. In these letters he confessed with perfect candor that he was in no position to do anything contrary to Russian wishes and that he was no equal member in the partnership. While these letters do not alter the broad lines of the picture of Prussian foreign policy at this moment as sketched by Krauel and Bailleu, they offer fresh details which are both interesting and significant.

The Ohio State University. WALTER L. DORN.

Rousseau and the Modern State. By ALFRED COBBAN, Lecturer in History, Armstrong College, in the University of Durham. (London: George Allen and Unwin; New York: John Day Company. 1935. Pp. 288. 10*s*.)

DR. Cobban writes of Rousseau in the great tradition of political and ethical theory. That is to say, he is writing on the whole the way philosophers have written for several thousand years, essentially analyzing "ideas" in terms of other "ideas". Himself a historian, he is by no means contemptuous of history, and at every point he insists that Rousseau was living in a specific environment. He uses the *Poland* and the *Corsica* to check up on the more abstract *Contract*. But (and one hopes the reference will not be a red rag of annoyance to too many readers of this review) he does, in a Pareto's terms, move steadily in the realm of the *dérivations* (rationalizations). He is not disturbed by the problem of the relation between abstractions and flesh-and-blood. He does not often ask himself what appetites, what interests are mixed with Rousseau's ideas. In this, of course, he is quite within his rights. The historian, however, cannot decently limit himself to the *dérivations* as can the philosopher. There is still room for a historical analysis of what happened to Rousseau's works when they were consumed by thousands of ordinary Frenchmen—or indeed, Europeans and Americans.

Within these limitations, Dr. Cobban has written an interesting little book, and one which opens large fields of pleasant mental exercise. His central thesis is directed against Vaughan's dichotomy between Rousseau the individualist and Rousseau the collectivist. Dr. Cobban feels that Rousseau is at least as consistent as a great thinker may be, and that on the whole his work is devoted to a defense of the ethically well-rounded individual against the tyranny of his fellows, singly or in groups. Dr. Cobban quite rightly insists that even in the *Social Contract,* Rousseau's "true interest is not the contract, which is rapidly passed over, but the General Will". Now the General Will, he continues, is indeed for Rousseau fully sovereign, indivisible, inalienable. The individual cannot be "free" to act against the General Will. But he denies that Rousseau identified the General Will, as did such followers as Hegel, with a specific state, or indeed with any fixed, permanent form of group action here on this planet. Not even the familiar

limitations of the General Will to the citizen body of a small city-state where everyone knows his neighbors, and where class conflicts are unknown, seem to Dr. Cobban to be the heart of the doctrine. Rousseau meant by the General Will pretty much what the Calvinist meant by the Rule of God. The General Will can be tyrannical only if God, or Right, or the Beautiful and the Good, can be tyrannical. The vulgar, but surprisingly frequent, judgment that Rousseau meant that the majority is always right Dr. Cobban disposes of at once.

Now all this is irreproachable. Rousseau did attempt to reconcile Liberty and Authority by maintaining that the individual who obeys the highest ethical authority is, by that very obedience, supremely free. This solution of the problem was not new with him, but he put it cogently, persuasively, and, above all, in terms more suited to the eighteenth century mind than those of traditional medieval Christian theology. But certain minds cannot help asking here, how can the individual know the Right, how can he be sure of the General Will? Dr. Cobban does not answer the question in so many words. But he does have interesting pages in which he analyzes specific examples of Rousseau's actual ethical judgments. These certainly add up to a total which is quite definitely on the side we still like to call "liberal". Put in realistic terms, it is nonsense to classify Rousseau among the authoritarians, the conservatives, the pessimists, the defenders of social and political inequality. The late Irving Babbitt knew a heretic when he saw one.

But this very fact makes it hard to accept Dr. Cobban's statements that, at long last, Burke and Rousseau are on the same side in the battle of Right and Wrong. Burke and Rousseau do have in common a hostility to the *philosophes*. Both do believe that some human faculty other than the "esprit de géométrie" is a surer guide to the individual choosing between Right and Wrong. Both are, in a sense, romantics. Burke, indeed, would probably accept the concept of the General Will as Dr. Cobban extracts it from Rousseau. But in their specific value judgments the two men are far apart. Manichean and Christian alike think theologically, alike reject the final validity of pure empiricism. But in no useful sense are Manichean and Christian on the same side of the fence. Burke felt the General Will, on the whole, lay with the few, and with a specific few, the British ruling classes. Rousseau may also have felt (with Robespierre) that the General Will lay with the few, though he certainly often talked as if it lay potentially with the many; he certainly felt that the elect few did not comprise any existing aristocracy.

There are some interesting appendixes, from manuscript sources, which show Antraigues, later a violently reactionary *émigré*, as a Rousseauist.

Harvard University. CRANE BRINTON.

The Italian Problem in European Diplomacy, 1847–1849. By A. J. P. TAYLOR, Assistant Lecturer in History in the University of Man-

chester. (Manchester: University Press. 1934. Pp. viii, 252. 8*s*. 6*d*.)

READERS who are guided by the title of Mr. Taylor's book will be disappointed in it. What it actually contains is a fresh and sometimes brilliantly illuminating study of the policies followed by the British, French, and Austrian governments in dealing with the issues that arose between them out of the Italian question in 1847–1849. It is based almost entirely on documents in the archives of those three powers, and these are generously quoted in the footnotes, so that the reader can follow the author in his interpretations with the context in full view.

But the diplomacy of Great Britain, Austria, and France does not give a complete picture of "European diplomacy", even with reference to the Italian question. The gaps and distortion of perspective which result from Mr. Taylor's having disregarded the part played by Russia and Prussia in the crisis have been expertly pointed out by reviewers. His treatment of "the Italian problem", which he undertakes without consulting a single Italian book or document, is also painfully lacking in substance and truth. This defect becomes of capital importance in vitiating his interpretation of the motives and policy of Charles Albert, and of the policy of Austria in Lombardy, though in the latter case his studies at Vienna bring to bear a beam of fresh light.

The strength of the book lies in the plane to which the author lifts the discussion of diplomatic action and in his analysis of the policy followed by Palmerston and the Austrians. Unsatisfied with the usual account of "day-to-day diplomacy", Mr. Taylor constantly refers the action of the diplomats to the deep persistencies of interest which to the thoughtful give to international relations "the appearance of a battle of Platonic ideas". Palmerston, for all his didactic exuberance, was a sound Englishman who wanted peace and a balance of power on the Continent, and believed, with justification, that he could get these with negligible risks for England; the French, for all their idealistic enthusiasm, did not want to fight Austria or create a strong Italy; Schwarzenberg, once Metternich with his efforts to base the Empire on the support of Europe was out of the way, was ready to stake the position of Austria solely on force: these were the realities, as Mr. Taylor sees them. If the Hamlet called for by the title is left out of the play, the hero is Palmerston, and Mr. Taylor's study is one to be reckoned with in any further attempt to measure the powers of that irrepressible genius. His analysis of Metternich is hardly less brilliant and penetrating. More broadly, the book leads to a fresh estimate of the importance of the upheaval of 1847–1849 in turning both Great Britain and Austria away from the policies by which the treaty-system of 1815 had been maintained.

The Johns Hopkins University. KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD.

Die nationalpolitische Publizistik Deutschlands vom Eintritt der neuen Ära in Preussen bis zum Ausbruch des deutschen Krieges: Eine

kritische Bibliographie. Von HANS ROSENBERG. Zwei Bände. (Munich: R. Oldenbourg. 1935. Pp. xxiv, 474; iv, 475–999. 25 M.)

IN this work, which owes its inspiration to Friedrich Meinecke, the Historische Reichskommission continues its notable series of the sources for the history of the founding of the German Empire. The editor has investigated the collections of eighty-six libraries in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland to complete his list of more than thirteen hundred political pamphlets and periodical articles. As none of the libraries seem to have made a systematic attempt to collect current pamphlets until later in the century, some of them are very scarce, appearing in only one or two collections. The location of these items is given. The methods and difficulties of the search and the principles of selection are clearly explained in the preface.

In analyzing and presenting the contents of the pamphlets and articles, the editor has aimed to give enough to show which ones are worth the attention of the special student and to enable those who seek merely general orientation on the currents of political thought to dispense with reading the complete work. The comparison of a few pamphlets in the reviewer's possession with Dr. Rosenberg's summaries indicates that the work has been conscientiously and skillfully done. The material has been grouped in ten chapters with appropriate subdivisions. This arrangement brings out the wide range of published opinion on practically every question. The only important exception is Schleswig-Holstein, on which there was until 1865 a monotonous unanimity among the German publicists.

As in the case of the parallel volumes of diplomatic documents, only more detailed study will show the real significance of this material and fit it into the history of the period. The study of public opinion presents peculiar difficulties and the influence of pamphlets is not easy to appraise. Dr. Rosenberg has tried to learn the numbers printed of each but was successful in only a few cases. He has, however, generally been able to determine the number of printings or editions which gives some indication of relative importance.

Some of the pamphlets and articles, those of Constantin Frantz, Heinrich von Treitschke, Bishop von Ketteler, for example, are fairly well known, and others, from a few libraries, have been used for partial studies of German public opinion that have been appearing in the last quarter century. Liberal opinion has, perhaps, received too large a place in the general histories; the Catholic and Socialist works are equally interesting. The variety of opinion on Bismarck was indicated by Nirrnheim's book on the first year of his ministry; the present collection suggests that there was a considerable body of German opinion ready to welcome the methods he used. A sentence from a pamphlet of 1860 reminds us of the sentiments of the famous speech to the budget commission: "Nicht mehr durch das Mittel der Freiheit, durch Reden und Verhandlungen, sondern nur durch Erweise unsrer militärischen

Macht, durch Taten, durch Kriege können wir es heute in Deutschland zu etwas bringen" (p. 169). Another of the same year makes it obvious that Bismarck was not the only German who believed: "Moralische Eroberungen macht man nur auf demselben Wege, auf dem man auch unmoralische macht, nämlich dass man überhaupt etwas erobert" (p. 180). The German collections of French utterances on the left bank of the Rhine can be matched by demands for Alsace-Lorraine, preventive war, and extensive Pan-Germanic annexations. Not all of the writers on foreign affairs, however, are so belligerent and one of them anticipates the Kellogg pact: "Jede Weltmacht verpflichtet sich, auf offene Gewalt oder Krieg gegen jede andere Weltmacht für immer Verzicht zu leisten" (p. 445).

The University of Minnesota. LAWRENCE D. STEEFEL.

Documents diplomatiques français, 1871–1914. Série I (1871–1900), tome VI, *8 avril 1885–30 décembre 1887.* [Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Commission de publication des Documents relatifs aux origines de la guerre de 1914.] (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1934. Pp. xxxix, 694. 60 fr.)

THIS volume, covering the period from the beginning of Freycinet's third ministry to the end of 1887, presents sufficient evidence for a study of French foreign policy during the most serious crisis in Franco-German relations and European politics since 1871. The great majority of these documents appear in print here for the first time. The contemporary *Livres jaunes* contain relatively unimportant correspondence relating to the Suez Canal and minor phases of the Balkan situation, and Bourgeois and Pagès (*Les origines et les responsabilités de la Grande Guerre*) give excerpts from only two of Courcel's reports (nos. 23, 29). The editors have not, as in the preceding volume, drawn material from private collections nor have they included anything from the presumably pertinent resources of the archives of the Ministère de la guerre. If the latter omission leaves Boulanger's activities in considerable obscurity, these documents deal with almost every important problem of European diplomacy during this period. Among the exceptions noted are the alarmist campaign against France in the official German press in August, 1885, England's attitude during the prolonged Franco-German tension in 1887, and the project for Pope Leo XIII's mediation (March, 1887) which attracted some attention in the press and is mentioned in the *Grosse Politik* (VI, 178, 179).

Ferry's defeat (March 30, 1885), with its repudiation of colonial expansion, did not immediately focus French policy upon Continental issues. Of the recently active colonial problems only Madagascar remained, but Egypt continued for months as the Quai d'Orsay's chief concern. Maintaining a strict neutrality during Germany's dispute with Spain over the Caroline Islands and even advising Spain at Bismarck's request to agree to its arbitra-

tion (nos. 59, 64), Freycinet repeatedly solicited his support in the Suez Canal negotiations (nos. 144, 153) and in securing from England a definite promise to evacuate Egypt on a specific date (nos. 317, 339). Bismarck encouraged France to independent action (no. 349), depicting the situation as unusually favorable (no. 350), but his own choice had been made (no. 334). France, he believed, had rejected "le grand jeu" of an anti-English coalition (nos. 27, 28). To support her would antagonize England without winning France's lasting gratitude as her reaction to his earlier services had shown. Although Freycinet had once referred to England as France's "natural ally" (no. 36), he nevertheless talked of resisting the perpetuation of England's occupation with all of the resources at France's command (no. 204), and he directed the French agent in Egypt to strengthen France's influence and to circumscribe England's wherever possible (no. 225).

Despite Boulanger's contribution to the chronic tension with Germany from the autumn of 1886, there are few direct references to him (*cf.* nos. 217, 390) and they usually occur in replies to Germany's complaints. His selection as president of the council or of the Republic, Bismarck declared (no. 415), would mean war, but of course no definite demand for his dismissal was ever made. He was, it is clear, an embarrassment to his colleagues. They not only prevented him from writing a personal letter to Alexander III but they also forced him, as Germany was informed, to agree not to order any troop movements or to advance a regiment toward the frontier without their consent (nos. 406, 423). Due to Bismarck's skepticism of the government's ability to resist the pressure of the still more intense chauvinist agitation especially in the event of a Russo-German war, Boulanger's elimination from the ministry (June, 1887) brought no lasting improvement in Franco-German relations. It was followed by a long series of frontier incidents. French diplomats insisted with evident sincerity upon France's complete lack of responsibility for the Franco-German crisis (Jan., Feb., 1887). Herbette especially was convinced that its immediate cause was Bismarck's desire to win public opinion for the Septennate (no. 390) and to secure a dependable majority in the Reichstag elections (no. 397). Although he was confident that the crisis would end peacefully with the attainment of these purposes (nos. 435, 439), he saw serious dangers in the increasing anticipation of an inevitable war as a result of the alarmist campaign in the inspired press (nos. 423, 425, 435) and in Bismarck's expectation of France's intervention in a Russo-German war.

The Penjdeh crisis on the Afghanistan frontier and the Bulgarian question enabled France to compete with Germany for Russia's favor. France's republican institutions and her uncertain political situation cooled Russia's interest in close relations with her (nos. 269, 362). With an eye on Berlin, Giers refused to receive Déroulède in 1887 (no. 595) and he asked the French government to prevent Boulanger's projected visit to Russia after he had been

dropped from the ministry (no. 542). The French soon learned of the renewal of the Triple Alliance, if not its concessions to Italy, but they did not even suspect the existence of the Reinsurance Treaty: "L'amitié russo-allemande", wrote the chargé d'affaires in Berlin, "tend de plus en plus à passer à l'état de souvenir" (no. 618). Nor were they much better informed as to England's relations with the Triple Alliance in the Mediterranean accords.

Duke University. E. MALCOLM CARROLL.

Documents diplomatiques français, 1871–1914. Série 2 (1901–1911), tome VI, 2 *janvier–6 juin 1905*. Série 3 (1911–1914), tome VIII, *11 août–31 décembre 1913*. [Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Commission de publication des Documents relatifs aux origines de la guerre de 1914.] (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1935. Pp. xlv, 629; xliv, 912. 60 fr. each.)

PRESIDENT Roosevelt: "God knows that I very much want to be re-elected, but I would a thousand times have preferred not to be than not to have taken Panama. . . . I would rather be a complete President for four years than half a one for eight. . . . When one knows what one wants, there is no need to read the newspapers; it is a useless fatigue" (VI, 62). These and many other observations of the advocate of the strenuous life, reported in M. Jusserand's charm of style and quiet humor, give Volume VI of the second series of French documents a special interest for American readers. President Roosevelt frequently conferred with the French ambassador in the spring of 1905 about the possibility of bringing the Russo-Japanese War to an end, and M. Jusserand was angling for Roosevelt's support in the approaching Morocco crisis. At the same time the Kaiser was fishing for him, as we know from Speck von Sternburg's dispatches in *Die grosse Politik*. But the President was wary in sniffing at the bait of both.

Of timely current interest today are eighteen dispatches, easily discoverable by the admirable analytical table of contents which the editors always prefix to each of these documentary volumes, which reveal Italy's efforts to get a strip of Menelik's territory to connect Italy's lands on either side of Ethiopia. In 1905 it was the English who had agreed to acquiesce in Italy's imperial ambitions, and it was the French who objected to an Italian corridor which would run behind French Somaliland, cut across the French railway under construction to Addis Ababa, and thus encroach upon a hinterland "which we [French] consider as a field reserved for our economic expansion" (VI, 21).

This volume naturally indicates also many of the varied repercussions of the Russo-Japanese War. French bankers demanded that Russia should allocate 260,000 francs a month for the duration of the war for bribing the French press to put Russian bonds in a favorable light (VI, 186 ff.). France

was embarrassed in her duties as a neutral by Rodjestvenski's long, long halts in Madagascar and French Indo-China. M. Delcassé was weakened in his Morocco policy by the impotence of his ally. And Bülow was encouraged to take a stiff attitude in supporting the sultan of Morocco against the demands of the Taillandier Mission.

The greater part of the 503 documents, however, deal with Moroccan affairs. It will be recalled that an official *Livre jaune* on this subject was published in the fall of 1905. As an interesting side light on the way it was "edited" by M. Paléologue, then political director at the Quai d'Orsay, it may be noted that he made a special trip to Berlin to give the French ambassador "explanations" as to what was to be included in the *Livre jaune* (VI, 403); and that all the documents now printed in the present volume were omitted from the *Livre jaune*, except two which are reprinted without change and fifteen which were largely suppressed, reworded, or in one case shifted and annexed to a dispatch of a different date.

Though the Morocco crisis has been carefully dealt with in the excellent volumes of O. J. Hale and E. N. Anderson, these documents add or emphasize a number of points. The Kaiser's Tangier trip was announced to the French naval attaché in Berlin as early as March 13. M. Delcassé was evidently very much worried indeed by Germany's sphinx-like silence, and made many efforts to get her to talk. He handed in his resignation on April 22, mainly as a consequence of domestic criticism and before German pressure became strong, but immediately consented to resume office. At his final resignation on June 6 (of which there is a dramatic account by M. Chaumié, minister of justice, which is printed in an appendix) he claimed to have a written promise of support from England of which "he read the text" and "believed that there was every interest in concluding this alliance" (VI, 602). It has often been said that he interpreted too liberally Lord Lansdowne's desire for "full and confidential discussion". But the liberal interpretation was quite as much the work of M. Paul Cambon in London as of poor M. Delcassé in Paris, as now appears from M. Cambon's dispatch of May 29 and very secret personal letter of June 1 (VI, 557 ff., 573).

Volume VIII of the third series deals with the difficult liquidation of the Balkan Wars up to the end of 1913, when the Liman von Sanders affair caused a new crisis in European diplomacy. The fate of the Aegean Islands, the frontier and government of Albania, Armenian reforms, the Turkish debt, and the rumors of new diplomatic combinations in the Balkans form a particularly tangled skein for the historian to unravel, inasmuch as the interests of the Great Powers often cut across their usual grouping into Triple Alliance and Triple Entente. They defy any summary or analysis in a brief review.

Aside from the problems of the seething Balkan cauldron, the three topics on which most light is thrown are: the power of French finance in

exerting political and economic leverage by the admission or exclusion of foreign loans on the Paris Bourse; the long negotiations for the settlement of the Bagdad Railway question and other claims to railway concessions in Turkey; and the negotiations for a new Anglo-German treaty for the eventual partition of the Portuguese colonies, in the course of which France put in a generous claim for the Cape Verde Islands, Portuguese Guinea, Cabinda and the Islands of San Thomé and Principé, all of which "would be very inferior to the shares of England and Germany" (VIII, 801). One gets a rather favorable impression of the wise and conciliatory attitude of M. Jules Cambon in Berlin (especially in connection with the Zabern incident, the Leipzig Centenary, and the Foreign Legion), and an equally unfavorable one of the jumpy and changeable character of M. Sazonov at St. Petersburg.

Harvard University. SIDNEY B. FAY.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

The Spanish Main, Focus of Envy, 1492–1700. By PHILIP AINSWORTH MEANS, Oficial de la Orden de el Sol del Perú. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1935. Pp. xi, 278. $3.00.)

"THE fundamental purpose [of Mr. Means in this] volume is to show some of the chief aspects of Spanish colonial rule in America and to display the nature of Spain's long conflict with her principal rivals." Accordingly, the author uses "the term 'The Spanish Main' in a wider sense than is customary" and employs it "to designate the whole vast area where Spanish power in America had its inception and where its vital arteries of commerce and of administration lay throughout the colonial period" (p. vii). After a brief account of the discovery and conquest of America he describes the earliest English and French intrusions in the Spanish Main, giving considerable attention to Hawkins and Drake. Chapters V and VI on the influence of El Dorado, "that myth of easy money", and its effect on the journeys of Orellana and Aguirre and the expeditions of Sir Walter Raleigh bring the sixteenth century to a close. Chapters VII through IX show how, in the seventeenth century, the English, French, and Dutch turned from what was for the most part sheer piracy to constructive colonization. The last chapter, "Two Centuries of Titanic Struggle: a Retrospect", is an analysis of the colonial systems of Spain, England, Holland, and France.

Mr. Means would be the first to admit that in this work he has produced little if any new factual knowledge but he deserves thanks for bringing together in an interesting manner much of the research not readily available to the ordinary student in this field. Although the reviewer does not like the author's unique form of citations and particularly resents the placing of the notes at the end of the chapters they are of considerable value and the

bibliography is extremely helpful. The map of the Spanish Main and surrounding regions is artistic and inclusive. Like all of Mr. Means's writings this book too has its share of individualisms: "The attitude of the King of Castile was, after 1525 or so, that of an over-zealous game preserving landlord, with the inevitable result that poachers thronged about in endless efforts to get at the dainty morsels within the ringfence" (p. 52). It would seem, however, as if he had gone a little too far when he insists on Anglicizing Sancti Spiritus (p. 43).

The specialist in the field of Hispanic American history will find the chief value of the book in the reactions which he will get to some of the theories advanced by Mr. Means regarding European colonization in America. Is it true "that in Spanish America there never was a frontier or a pioneer fringe in the sense that those terms are used in English America" (p. 250)? Is it to be admitted that "because of the special graciousness, flexibility, and resourcefulness which characterize the French intellect, coupled with an innate distaste for violence, harshness, cruelty, or any other extremity, the French people made, by gentle means, far more headway among the native peoples whom they encountered than did the more vehement and unbending Spaniards" (p. 251)? Will every one agree that "In the Caribbean islands the native race was early exterminated because the Spaniards had not yet mastered the technique of building a bi-racial society having a culture in part derived from native sources and in part from Spanish" (p. 243), in view of the fact that having learned the "technique" the Spanish never succeeded in applying it in the regions inhabited by the Yaquis or the Apaches? Finally, "if France or England had taken the regions held by Spain", is it "likely that the English would have pushed the Indians into the Eastern jungles and replaced them with Negro slaves, and that the French would have built up an even better bi-racial civilization than did the Spaniards, doing so with far less hardship to the native elements" (p. 243)? In short, the reviewer feels that in reaching his conclusions Mr. Means has not given due consideration to geographic, economic, and ethnographic variations in America and has paid too much attention to European political and religious factors.

As is to be expected in a book by Mr. Means, there is a minimum of typographical errors. The index is excellent and the format of the volume is pleasing.

Occidental College. OSGOOD HARDY.

Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America. Edited by ELIZABETH DONNAN, Professor of Economics and Sociology in Wellesley College. Volume IV, *The Border Colonies and the Southern Colonies.* (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1935. Pp. xv, 719. $6.50.)

THE final volume in this useful series deals with the continental colonies from Maryland southward to Louisiana. It is edited with the same care and fullness that distinguished its predecessors. As in the case of the third volume, which dealt with the New England and Middle Colonies (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVIII, 768–769), Miss Donnan has not attempted to apportion space equally among the localities with which she has to deal, but has treated most colonies only briefly, concentrating upon a fuller exposition of the materials relating to one. In this case South Carolina offered the obvious field for major exploitation. Not only was this colony most important in the slave traffic itself, but it provided in the letter books of Henry Laurens an unparalleled body of material from which to draw. One half the volume is devoted to South Carolina and three fifths of the documents in that half are from the Laurens letter books. Of the other colonies Virginia occupies more than half the remaining space; North Carolina and the Floridas are unrepresented except for a few items in the introduction.

The first two volumes, and to a large extent the third, were concerned with the traffic from the point of view of merchants interested in the carrying trade and in markets at distant points. The present volume is the first in which the business is viewed primarily as one of imports and in which the merchants concerned are chiefly interested in the local market. Consequently we read very little of conditions on the African coast or the Middle Passage, but much of import duties, quarantine regulations, and methods of retail sale. The planters' attitude, conspicuously absent from the documents in the first two volumes, is frequently discussed in Laurens's letters to British correspondents for whom he acted as agent. We are told, for example, that, contrary to apparent principles of supply and demand, a large cargo ordinarily brought higher average prices than a small parcel of slaves, for a large, well-advertised sale would attract planters from a wider area who would be unwilling to return home empty-handed and who, in the rush to buy, would overlook minor deficiencies in the Negroes put up for sale. We learn something more of the planters' preferences among the different types of slaves imported, and especially of the South Carolinians' dislike for Calabar Negroes, who, among other undesirable qualities, were too prone to commit suicide.

Colonial efforts to restrict and even to stop the import trade by prohibitory duties are illustrated in many documents. The discussions on this matter emphasize the point that checks were desired not from humanitarian motives —although there are hints of these in Laurens's letters—but because of the adverse effects of overimportation upon the credit of the colony and of the individual planters. The efforts of the Georgia Trustees to prohibit slavery and the opposition of the settlers to the prohibition receive considerable attention. Statistical tables of imports add concrete data to materials otherwise chiefly of illustrative value.

This volume brings to completion one more of the historical enterprises undertaken by the Carnegie Institution under Dr. Jameson's direction. This reviewer must voice again his regret that the West Indies are not to receive direct attention similar to that accorded the continental colonies, for in the islands lay some of the most important markets and the real center of the trade. But in spite of this omission, the series will stand as a contribution of high order, well conceived and ably executed, for which its sponsors and its editor deserve the thanks of all who have to deal with this unhappy episode of early American history.

Yale University. LEONARD W. LABAREE.

Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania. By ANNE BEZANSON, ROBERT D. GRAY, MIRIAM HUSSEY, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania. [Industrial Research Department, Wharton School, Research Studies, XXVI.] (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1935. Pp. xix, 445. $4.00.)

BASED upon price quotations in newspapers and merchants' trade books, this excellent study presents a survey not as its title indicates of prices in Pennsylvania but of wholesale prices in Philadelphia. The authors have compiled price averages for twenty-two commodities and have plotted the price trends between 1720 and 1775. The years 1741–1745 have been used as the base period and the prices are recorded in Pennsylvania currency.

The results of the study have a peculiar importance in view of the fact that during the period surveyed Philadelphia rose to pre-eminence among the commercial centers of America. This vigorous growth is clearly indicated by the price trends—which reveal that the city enjoyed an increasingly favorable trade position. Despite eight cyclical price movements (the causes of which the authors do not explain) the general tendency of prices was upward. And when this trend is analyzed it appears that the prices of the staples of the colony—wheat, flour, bread, staves, beef, and pork—were chiefly responsible for the upswing. The prices of the principal imports—salt, rum, molasses, rice, pitch, tar, muscavado sugar, and British goods—either rose less sharply or followed a horizontal trend. The spread between the rising prices of domestic staples (of which there was an expanding production) and the more stable prices of imports demonstrates that the city was enjoying a favorable margin of profit in its trade.

What groups benefited by these changes? Certainly the merchants, among others—a fact attested by the seasonal fluctuations of prices and by the marketing system of the colony. The chief domestic staples were subject to marked price variations, whereas the prices of many imported goods remained fairly constant throughout the year. Such seasonal changes obviously benefited the merchants, since it was their practice to buy when prices were low and to sell when they were high. The indebted farmers, on the

other hand—unable to withhold their produce from the market—had to sell when prices were unfavorable. The stability of the prices of imports in turn meant that the farmers, in making purchases, did not benefit from seasonal "lows". These facts explain in part the capital accumulations of the Philadelphia merchants during the middle period of the eighteenth century.

To historians this study has great value as a collection of important data, admirably analyzed and arranged. That the authors have worked in a scientific spirit is attested by their refusal to draw conclusions unwarranted by a selected and limited body of facts. The prices of individual products were affected by so many special factors that generalization about the causes of particular changes becomes impossible. It may be noted that the first issues of paper currency in Pennsylvania were followed by a sharp upswing in the price level. Moreover, the relative stability of prices and of sterling exchange supports the theories of Ricardo and Mill that paper currency need not be convertible into specie, since the paper of Pennsylvania at this time was not redeemable on demand. The study raises doubts about the modern theory of a managed currency: the prices of many commodities moved sharply against the general price level; and producers and debtors are affected by such particular prices rather than by general prices. Although the authors have not considered the bearing of monetary factors on prices, a companion study of Pennsylvania paper currency would now demonstrate the relation between the two. Similar studies of retail prices and of wholesale prices in other parts of the province would throw light upon the distribution of income among economic groups. When such surveys are available for other colonies some of the most fundamental problems of the economic history of early America may be solved.

The University of Wisconsin. CURTIS NETTELS.

Washington's Farewell Address, in Facsimile, with Transliterations of all the Drafts of Washington, Madison, and Hamilton, together with their Correspondence and other Supporting Documents. Edited by VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS. (New York: Public Library. 1935. Pp. xvi, 360. $12.50.)

AFTER many years of delay this publication of the Farewell Address, with a transliteration of the various texts which contributed to it, now appears in a volume which is a tribute both to editor and to printer. The originals exist in the New York Public Library, where they have been jealously guarded, and in the Library of Congress, where they have been in safe custody but easily available to all comers. The prize document of all, of course, is the New York Public Library's original of Washington's final draft as it went to the printer. All of this is here reproduced in facsimile, and there are illustrative facsimiles of representative pages from some of the

other texts. In addition many letters assembled from various libraries and collections are printed, letters relating to the Address and to the later bewilderment concerning its authorship. In a not overlong introduction the editor describes with great care the process of composition and the precise relation of Madison, Hamilton, and Jay to the immortal document. He corrects Horace Binney's lengthy monograph of 1859 (incidentally one of the earliest examples of competent historical criticism in the United States) in at least one particular—the separate identity of Hamilton's "Draft for Incorporating", distinct from his "Original Major Draft". In general Mr. Paltsits thinks that Binney was logical and nearly correct, though verbose and tautological and sometimes careless, in concluding that the ideas of the Address were Washington's, the order, symmetry, amplification and illustration, together with the literary form, Hamilton's.

The documents could be arranged to better critical advantage to show the evolution of the Address. First is given Washington's final copy for the printer; after that in chronological order the various drafts which preceded it. The device of parallel columns spread on opposite pages, and arranged left to right, would have been far more enlightening to the reader, enabling him to note at a glance where Washington took and where he refused to take the words or the ideas of his intimate advisers.

The editor restricts himself altogether to the textual history of the document itself. He says nothing about the even more interesting relationship of contemporary foreign relations to the Address, particularly the French imbroglio; nor does he explain a most important point: that if Washington had resigned in 1792 as he originally contemplated, the famous advice on foreign policy could not have been the same. That portion of the valedictory was the result of the first President's experience with foreign affairs during his second term, after the great war between England and France had broken out and raised the problem of American neutrality, leading to the treaties with England and Spain, and the quarrel with France.

It is to be hoped that now that this publication is completed, the priceless originals in the New York Public Library will be wholly available to qualified students, as they have always been in the Library of Congress. But for all but the most minute purposes the facsimile and the transliterations here presented will suffice for the needs of the investigator.

Yale University. SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS.

John Jay. By FRANK MONAGHAN. (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company. 1935. Pp. xi, 497. $4.00.)

HERE is a John Jay who will be new in many respects to most people. A patriot and an ardent believer in liberty, a Calvinist of unexpected compromises and adamantine inflexibilities, a sober intellect who could recognize humor betimes, but never in its application to himself, and a man of

courage and devotion to duty. In his personal and family relationships lies the key to John Jay's character. The opening chapter of Professor Monaghan's biography sets the tempo and fixes the treatment he accords his subject, and there are few instances where the dry bones of ancestral records have been rattled in a more entertaining manner.

Jay's barrister days are engagingly treated and his activities in the Continental Congress enlivened by the spicy anecdote of Jefferson's rescue of Richard Henry Lee from Jay's wrath; a rescue in which neither Lee nor Jefferson appear to advantage. The supreme political importance, however, of the work of the secret committee of Congress, of which Jay was a member, has been passed over with a hasty touch which is disappointing to the ever present hope for new light on this obscure matter. Naturally a biography cannot become a history; but a too hurried treatment of background may prove, at times, detrimental to biography. To this hurried pace may be attributed the error (p. 119) of fastening upon Silas Deane the authorship of the proposal to bribe Spain by declaring war upon Portugal. Deane was here simply carrying out his instructions, the insane resolution for which is spread on the journals of the Continental Congress, December 30, 1776. Also, mention of Deane though brief should not be contradictory; he is called a blundering diplomat, yet is credited with having performed important services to America which a blundering diplomat could not possibly have rendered in France at that peculiarly sensitive time in European politics. Jay's failure in his Spanish mission, for which he was in nowise responsible, is well described. The reader is caught in the coils of Spanish evasion and delay and shares with Jay the dragging weight of that depressing negotiation. Gloomy as it was it yet holds an element of humor when viewed from the Spanish standpoint, and a humor all the more refreshing from its being unrecognizable by Jay. The peace negotiations of 1782–1783 are clearly disentangled and though new matter was not to be expected the story is given a fresh atmosphere, even to the pipe smashing anecdote. (Did not Napoleon use the selfsame gesture with a vase, a few years later, but *prior* to William Jay's use of the story?) The chapter on the chief justice is one of the best. Professor Monaghan properly justifies his claim that Jay's decisions were the foundations for Marshall's later and more widely known pronouncements, and that much of our constitutional strength was built into the governmental structure by the patriotic beliefs and judicial erudition of John Jay. George Clinton's political skulduggery and Jay's governorship are spicy thumbnail sketches of New York state politics of the period. The negotiation of the treaty for which, ironically enough, Jay is best remembered, is covered in a well-condensed narrative which properly accents Hamilton's indiscreet conversation with Hammond; but Professor Monaghan's Jay does not seem to be the man who could have perceived or used the threat of the armed neutrality against Grenville. His portrait is that of a

man possessed of the familiar strength of the men of the Revolution, and of many of their weaknesses; but it is, withal, the portrait of an American patriot.

Washington. J. C. FITZPATRICK.

Ulysses S. Grant, Politician. By WILLIAM B. HESSELTINE. [American Political Leaders, edited by Allan Nevins.] (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 1935. Pp. xiii, 480. $4.00.)

THIS work is a study of the political record of President Grant. Two brief chapters—one called "Forty Years of Failure" and another on the Civil War phase under the heading "Success"—cover the preparatory period. These are only introductory to the main theme, but serviceable and satisfactory for the purposes of the author. A quotation from the preface will set the task which he assumed. "Grant's enemies were more literate than his friends. Consciously or unconsciously they stuffed the ballot boxes of history against Grant, and the writer has essayed a recount." The result is a biography of Grant which should take its place as no ordinary achievement. The recount, in the main, finds that the charges of Grant's stupidity and corruption "were born in partisan politics". With great skill Dr. Hesseltine has traced the transition from the statesmanship of a high order Grant exhibited at Appomattox to the partisanship he adopted. "Although he grew as a President his growth was that of a party politician." And quoting from the preface again—"As he acquired the ideology of the politician he lost the vision of the statesman."

In the treatment of the man Grant the author rises to historical criticism of a high quality. It is in some of the by-products or side issues of the work that he lays himself open to challenge. For example, to write, as he does on page 48, of events in 1865, that "industrial magnates laid dark plots to preserve the war created tariffs" and on page 69 that "the masters of capital were in the saddle" is to conjure up a class that either did not yet exist or if it did was not obliged to resort to dark plots. The author some pages later (p. 291) sets 1868–1876 as the period for the transfer of authority to the masters of capital. It is written (p. 131) of the election of 1868, "Without Negro suffrage, the general [Grant] would have been defeated." Obviously the author has confused for the moment a popular majority with an electoral majority. One is impelled to challenge the wisdom of phrases like those on page 401 where Blaine and the Mulligan letters are under consideration—"Interspersed with his [Blaine's] comments, *doubtless* edited as they were read and with some letters *perhaps* suppressed entirely, the correspondence appeared innocent enough." (Italics are the reviewer's.) By insinuations unsupported by any evidence on the record the historian has thrown away his defenses.

Chapter XXV is, in the opinion of this reviewer, the weakest part of the

book. It covers the contested election. "A Disturbed Exit" is the author's title. In view of his presentation a better one would have been "How the Republicans stole the Election". One suspects he has allowed partisan records and literary effects to confuse his process of the "recount". As the law of the land stood—with the Negroes enfranchised—it was the Southern Democrats who tried to steal the election, and had to, if they won. The Republicans had an advantage, unfair and exasperating, it may be conceded, but an advantage which they proceeded to employ. The dramatic episode of a sudden discovery in the dark of night of an opportunity to steal the election and the hurried dispatch of visiting statesmen may make an interesting story, but it may be doubted whether such an event altered the course of history. The stealing process was then over, the carpetbaggers prepared to claim all, without stimuli from G.O.P. headquarters. The author seems to show that Tilden was lacking in spunk, that there was no danger of war, and yet concludes that the "Republicans surrendered the Negro to the Southern ruling class, and abandoned the idealism of Reconstruction, in return for the peaceable inauguration of their President" (p. 421). That is surely not a sound historical interpretation of the Wormley Hotel conference. The mess of 1876 has been better treated by the authorities Dr. Hesseltine cites in his footnote.

Western Reserve University. ELBERT J. BENTON.

James G. Blaine: a Political Idol of Other Days. By DAVID SAVILLE MUZZEY. [American Political Leaders, edited by Allan Nevins.] (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 1934. Pp. xi, 514. $4.00.)

THIS is the best biography of Blaine now available. The author undertook a difficult task, for Blaine, a scintillating, brilliant genius, is an elusive subject. In many respects he still remains an enigma. In chapter V, for example, wherein the question of Blaine's integrity with reference to the Mulligan letters is discussed, the reader secures little important, new information as to the measure of guilt, if any, to be placed upon Blaine. That Blaine failed to avoid the appearance of evil is, at times, about all that one may confidently assert. He seldom revealed the state of his bank accounts and investments.

Similarly, mystery still hovers over the reasons for a second marriage ceremony and the effacement of a date on a tombstone of his first child during the campaign of 1884. Blaine brought suit for libel against the Indianapolis *Sentinel,* only to humiliate his chief counsel, Benjamin Harrison, by peremptorily telegraphing him to drop proceedings, and giving out a public statement that he "could not get justice from an Indiana jury". The author apparently failed to grasp the public importance of this episode, which gives an additional clue to the causes of the dramatic break between Blaine and Harrison in 1892. Harrison wrote: "the suit was not advised by me . . .

not because I did not appreciate the grossness and unspeakable cruelty of the attack but because of my experience of that kind of a suit as a means of redress for such an injury." Blaine paid Harrison's law firm only the costs of the suit, $640.98, but said nothing about paying a fee.

Chapter XVII gives a masterful analysis of other causes of the break between Blaine and Harrison. One major cause is omitted, *viz.*, the jealousy of Mrs. Blaine and her strong antipathy toward all of the Harrisons. This jealousy existed as early as 1882, as indicated by the significant quotations on page 273, and reached its climax on that day in April, 1892, when, distraught because President Harrison refused to promote her son-in-law, Mrs. Blaine called on him, spoke "fierce words", and left with a "harsh look" on her face. The President's son, Russell, who constantly worried his father, added to the strain between the two families. His articles in *Leslie's Weekly* and in newspapers were often offensive to Blaine. One editorial in 1891 so angered him that Alger wrote Clarkson: "I have never seen a man so mad. . . . B. paced the floor and was as livid as death itself. He says 'this comes from headquarters purposely while the President is absent'."

Perhaps no really satisfying biography of Blaine can ever be written. The paucity of references to original documents indicates the terrific handicap under which Professor Muzzey labored. In 1891, the Hon. Louis A. Dent, Blaine's private secretary, was ordered to cart out of Blaine's Maine home and burn bundle after bundle of an immense collection of private papers. Evidently a small number, centering around the events of 1884 and 1892, remain. In a "definitive" biography, one has a right to expect in the bibliography an accurate and somewhat detailed history and description of the subject's private papers. Little light is thrown on this question, though two of Blaine's daughters and two private secretaries are still living.

Under such circumstances it becomes imperative to consult innumerable, widely scattered collections, and, as was said of Lord Acton, "to toil in the archives in search of the little fact that makes the difference". This biography apparently was written without crossing the Appalachians to consult such collections as the Foraker Papers in Cincinnati, the Allison Papers in Des Moines, the Hayes Papers in Fremont, and other, hitherto unused papers of contemporary men of second-rate importance.

Regarding the bibliography one may ask whether Blaine's "Published Writings" and *The Letters of Mrs. James G. Blaine* should not have been listed under "Source Material", and whether the number of volumes, and the date and place of publication should not have been given for books listed. A careful comparison with the originals of some letters printed by Gail Hamilton in her *Biography of James G. Blaine,* which is so often cited, shows that no reliance can be placed upon the accuracy of her printed versions. No similar test was possible for *The Letters of Mrs. James G. Blaine,* but obviously in both cases the family selected the letters to be printed.

According to the author, Blaine reached his apogee of popularity on March 4, 1875, when he retired as Speaker of the House amid universal respect. His two deepest disappointments were his failure to secure the nomination for President in 1876, and the tragic frustration of his grandiose plans for the foreign policy of Garfield's administration. In chapters showing real literary skill and constituting perhaps the best part of the biography, Blaine's career is traced from Speaker to presidential nominee in 1884. The description of Blaine's private life and the critical analysis of his *Twenty Years of Congress* are excellent.

Blaine's work as Secretary of State under Harrison is treated largely on the basis of secondary material, and therefore can add little that is new. It suffers somewhat from imbibing some of the spirit of Blaine partisans in belittling President Harrison—an attitude reflected earlier by Professor Muzzey in his textbook, *A History of the American People* (1927), p. 463. In introducing Blaine as Secretary of State in 1889, the biography states: "It was Harrison, not Blaine, who outlined the policy of the incoming Administration" (p. 390). That fact was generally lost sight of in writing chapters XV and XVI. Blaine was a broken man by 1891; a study of his health, noting the dates of illness, would make it impossible for historians to ascribe to him notes written during such times.

In describing the work of the Department of State it is risky to ascribe diplomatic notes to the Secretary who happens to have his name attached, unless other evidence indicates that he actually composed them and that they represent his own thoughts. This principle is, however, seldom followed by recent writers on Baine's foreign policy, and not always observed in the useful ten volumes of *The American Secretaries of State and their Diplomacy*. Professor Muzzey, through no fault of his own, did not have access to the Harrison Papers which would have helped him solve parts of this problem; much of it probably never can be solved. In most cases it would have been more accurate to write "The United States replied", or "To this the State Department answered". On page 399, for example, the author, referring to Samoa, writes: "When Blaine gave his instructions to our delegates" and "there was a marked heightening of tone in Blaine's language". But Harrison in a confidential memorandum wrote: "The line of action and correspondence was considered between Mr. B. and myself with perfect agreement. Every note was submitted to me and discussed—more than once suggestions made by me were cordially adopted by Mr. B. and on one occasion a note prepared by him was thrown aside and another written by him to embody views I had suggested and which he cordialy accepted." The author speaks (p. 422) of "Blaine's ultimatum of January 21 to Chile". The milder note prepared by the Department of State was, however, discarded entirely by Harrison, who then drew up the ultimatum which went forward under Blaine's signature (*cf.* pp. 465–467 with ch. XV). In 1891, especially,

many of the important notes which were sent to London, Rome, and Santiago were written originally in the President's own hand.

In the last two chapters Professor Muzzey is at his best again. He gives a just estimate of Blaine's claim to statesmanship. Blaine's Hawaiian and Isthmian Canal policies anticipated by twenty years the work of Hay, Roosevelt, and Root, while his brilliant Pan-American policy, based upon positive leadership in international co-operation, anticipated many of the ideals of Woodrow Wilson and some of the policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Ohio University. A. T. Volwiler.

Abram S. Hewitt, with Some Account of Peter Cooper. By Allan Nevins. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1935. Pp. xiii, 623. $4.00.)

This volume suggests the wealth of manuscript material, some of it illuminating important phases of American history, that awaits an ordering hand and an interpreting mind to enlarge our literary heritage. Mr. Nevins has made diligent use of nine significant sources of this kind, in addition to numerous books and pamphlets, to write a biography of two men who well merit such a record. These sources include the family papers of Abram Hewitt and his father and of Peter Cooper, the firm papers of Cooper and Hewitt, and the Tilden, Cleveland, and Carnegie papers, besides less important collections. Mr. Nevins has handled them with ability and insight, and with a grace of presentation that makes his characters live and pictures vividly the social and industrial conditions of their time.

Peter Cooper possessed a distinction of character that made him in his day, which was long, one of the most prominent private citizens of the Republic. He exemplified the finest community spirit of a generation that all but remembered the living Franklin, whom he resembled in his homely devotion to civic service. His son-in-law, Abram Hewitt, manifested a like zeal for the public welfare, but he belonged to a period when the country had outgrown its old-time neighborliness. This difference of early environment as well as his training and temperament gave a different turn to his activities. Both men were gifted with a native shrewdness in practical affairs which brought them material prosperity and kept them from fanciful social doctrines. Yet they were as truly social idealists as the most emotional visionary that ever mounted a soapbox.

Peter Cooper could not have been omitted from a life of Abram Hewitt, for if he did not wholly determine his son-in-law's career he gave it direction and quality. Without him the younger man would doubtless have become eminent. The scholarly interests and ability he exhibited at Columbia College promised him success in science or the professions. He became instead the most progressive ironmaster in the United States because Peter Cooper set him in that path. During his early and middle life the families of the two men formed virtually a joint household where the Cooper influence

colored civic and social opinion. These household ties anchored Hewitt in New York when his business instinct told him that the West was the land of opportunity for steel. He was a keen, incisive executive, devoted to system and efficiency, while Peter Cooper remained a leisurely business patriarch. The crowning achievement of the elder man was Cooper Union, which he created after his own vision; but Abram Hewitt was the able manager who kept the institution smoothly functioning.

Hewitt's active life began in his early twenties when Peter Cooper placed him and his own son in charge of his ironworks at Trenton. His subsequent career falls into three periods, when his dominant interests were in turn iron-making, national politics, and municipal reform. From the middle forties until the middle seventies he was primarily an ironmaker and during these three decades was probably the ablest all-round leader in the industry. Both he and the younger Cooper had originating minds, Hewitt's turning to questions of policy and administration and that of his associate to technical details. He discovered and developed new outlets for his company's products while Cooper devised means of making those products cheaply. Late in the forties, when rolling rails, which was the first major branch of iron manufacture in America, proved temporarily unprofitable he turned to wire, which was in great demand for the new telegraph lines, and encouraged John Roebling to set up his cable works at Trenton thus enlarging the local market for this product. During the slack period which followed the railway boom of the early fifties he directed his attention to making structural iron and in 1853 and 1854 rolled the first I beams made in America and started a new era in fireproof construction. During the Civil War, when he worked at minimum profits to help the Union, he perfected the first manufacture of gun metal in America, thus liberating us from dangerous dependence on England, which hitherto had monopolized this manufacture, at a time when the government of that country was none too friendly toward us. He made frequent trips abroad to inform himself about the more advanced methods of Great Britain and the Continent and as a commissioner to the Paris Exposition of 1867 investigated and made a classic report upon the new steel processes recently developed there. Upon his return from this visit he established at Trenton the first open-hearth furnaces in America. Throughout his active supervision of his company he labored to substitute science for empiricism in furnace, foundry, and mill practice. In this respect, as in sensing and seizing new markets for his products, he stood at the head of his contemporaries in the business.

Cooper and Hewitt did not keep step in politics as closely as in other matters though they were actuated by similar ideals and motives. They rebelled against the corruption rampant in the government after the Civil War and were equally eager for reform. But Cooper's homespun mind was more open than Hewitt's disciplined and cosmopolitan intellect to the pet fallacies of the masses. In 1876, after ten years' advocacy of radical monetary

doctrines Cooper became the greenback candidate for President. On the other hand Hewitt, like his similar minded contemporary Edward Atkinson, was simultaneously a sound money man and a tariff reformer. In 1874 Hewitt's intimacy with his New York neighbor Samuel Tilden, then leader of both the state and the national democracy, brought him an unsolicited nomination for Congress from a district that included a section of Manhattan's lower east side. Because he was known as a friend of labor and was the son-in-law of a benefactor of the humble man he received the support of constituents not usually enthusiastic for candidates of his type. They kept him in Congress for twelve years, when he retired against his party's wishes. His business ability soon made him the financier of the democratic national organization and a leader in its higher councils; but he could not run it as he could his iron works.

The great episode of Hewitt's political life was the Tilden-Hayes contest. He left a secret inside history of this critical and dramatic incident which, supplemented from other new sources, makes Mr. Nevins's account of the controversy the most authoritative and the nearest definitive that we possess. The probability that Tilden was entitled to the election grows stronger in the light of this evidence; but neither party emerges from the carnival of corruption a spotless victim of outraged innocence.

During the remainder of his life Abram Hewitt continued to be a man of national significance whose public interests were largely centered in his own community. For one term he was mayor of New York, nominated to defeat Henry George who suddenly loomed politically portentous before the conservative citizens and the professional party workers of the metropolis. He did not ingratiate himself with the latter and was not re-elected, but he gave the city an administration as honest and efficient as its defective charter permitted. Moreover he kept in touch with municipal affairs the rest of his life and was actively behind such important city measures as tenement house reform, parks in congested areas, and the subway system. Such was his place to the last in the community in which he lived that after he passed away Ex-Mayor Seth Low "spoke for all" when he said: "New York seems lonely without Mr. Hewitt".

The Library of Congress. VICTOR S. CLARK.

Theodore Roosevelt and the Japanese-American Crises: an Account of the International Complications arising from the Race Problem on the Pacific Coast. By THOMAS A. BAILEY, Assistant Professor of History, Stanford University. (Stanford University: Stanford University Press. 1934. Pp. ix, 353. $3.00.)

MR. Bailey has described with rich detail the series of crises in our relations with Japan between 1905 and 1909, of which the most notable was San Francisco's order in 1906 segregating Japanese children in an Oriental

school. He portrays vividly the excitement in both countries and the diplomatic exchanges in which the two governments calmly sought a solution that would meet reasonable demands of California, save Japan's pride, satisfy public opinion in both countries, and preserve friendly relations. The author tells the story of Roosevelt's bold stroke in sending the fleet on its world cruise against the hysterical opposition of the Atlantic seaboard and at the possible risk of war with Japan. He shows how this voyage was used to restore Japanese-American good will. The use of numerous hitherto unused letters and documents in the Roosevelt Papers and the Department of State has made this a notable contribution. Unlike some older "objective" historians, Mr. Bailey has gone further than mere accumulation of "facts" and has essayed the role of interpreter. Cautiously, persuasively, free from Californian race prejudice, he has judged the actors in his drama and described forces and motives that explain why things happened as they did. He shows how passions, a jingoist press, and politicians willing to risk the country's well-being for personal ends, brought the nations near to war, and how effective governments really eager to avoid war can be in calming popular emotions and discovering peaceable solutions even in serious crises. Both governments he credits with courtesy, patience, reasonableness. He accuses the German Kaiser of trying to goad Roosevelt into war through alarming bits of confidential misinformation. He drives home the lesson of the power one unreasonable state has under our constitutional system to embroil the whole nation in war. For California's action, Mr. Bailey blames Hearst, the corrupt machine politicians who controlled San Francisco, the Labor element who feared Oriental competition, but above all race prejudice. He justifies Roosevelt in disregarding state rights for the general good and shows how Roosevelt alternately persuaded and browbeat California into a measure of fairness while he kept the Japanese convinced of his own good will toward them. Here was a characteristic use of the "big stick" to obtain a square deal, this time for a foreign power. Mr. Bailey believes the "big stick" did more good than harm but that the same ends could have been better attained by less spectacular devices. He shows Roosevelt's capacity to yield his own desire for an amicable mingling of races when he found an unworkable theory confronted by the stubborn fact of race prejudice. Mr. Bailey deplores the outburst of race feeling in California. He feels that the exclusion of Japanese by peaceful agreement came as a result of it with greater speed, but with lasting ill feeling that could have been avoided. Perhaps the most interesting revelation of the book is Roosevelt, usually portrayed as impulsive and fond of a fight, shown patiently guiding the nation through these trying years on a course of peace while he preserved unusual calmness of judgment in the face of alarmist stories sent him by the Kaiser, of popular hysteria and jingoism, and of recurring incidents that would have given a less levelheaded ruler reason for plunging into war. One wishes Mr. Bailey had analyzed further the warmongers and their motives; the

school incident seems overemphasized; more attention to economic causes of the conflict would have strengthened the book. Mr. Bailey consciously ruled out any account of the relation to his subject of American and Japanese activities in continental Asia, but its absence is regrettable. In deciding that the voyage of the fleet accomplished much good, he seems to give undue consideration to short-time benefits and to underestimate the more far-reaching effect on navalism, imperialism, and rivalry in both nations that is now bearing fruit. Yet the book as a whole is excellent. Mr. Bailey has been thorough, careful, competent. He writes lucidly. His presentation lends the book interest and significance beyond most monographs of such narrow scope. Furthermore, no American who reads this work could be swept into war with Japan by jingoes of his own day. The volume takes its place beside Dennett's *Roosevelt and the Russo-Japanese War* and Hill's *Roosevelt and the Caribbean* as a model that it is to be hoped will be followed by others exploring special phases of recent history.

The University of North Carolina. HOWARD K. BEALE.

War Memoirs of Robert Lansing, Secretary of State. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company. 1935. Pp. 383. $3.50.)

SOME tinge of mystery has surrounded the publication of this volume and the suggestion has not been lacking that a more complete edition of Mr. Lansing's papers than is here included might have revealed a different picture of the motive forces in American diplomacy. Inevitably attention has been called to the omission of reference to the problems of international loans and the lack of emphasis upon economic factors in our diplomacy. The omission is the more striking since almost at the moment of publication the Senate Committee made available documents indicating the interest taken by Lansing as well as McAdoo in precisely those problems. It is certainly unfortunate that the brief publishers' note at the head of the volume was not extended so as to state the exact period during which the manuscript was prepared, whether there was any clear principle according to which documents were included or excluded, who it was that assumed responsibility of preparing it for the press, and whether that responsibility permitted any editing of the text beyond rearrangement and omission of portions not directly relevant to the World War.

On the other hand, the present reviewer finds it entirely natural that Mr. Lansing, writing in the middle twenties, should have laid the emphasis where it comes in this book and discovers no indication that he or anyone else omitted any material for any reason except the exigencies of space or clarity. Previous to Lansing's death there was almost universal acceptance of the fact that American intervention in the war resulted directly from the German submarine campaign and that without it America would have avoided active participation. "Intrigues" of bankers and munitions-makers

had not been credited. Public thought still assumed the wisdom of maintaining the traditional neutral right to export goods and money. The public mind still held Germany to have been an international criminal. It is not surprising that Mr. Lansing should not have discussed the contrary point of view, which had not yet been publicly expressed. For him the chief point demanding explanation was the prolonged reluctance of Mr. Wilson to enter the war.

The book was never completed so as to cover Mr. Lansing's official career in its entirety. He begins with his assumption of the Secretaryship of State, in June, 1915, passing over the problems he had met as counselor during the preceding year; he carries the narrative only through a portion of the year 1917, with little material of importance after American intervention. There is nothing on the latter days of the war or the Peace Conference. The chief theme of the book is the troubled state of relations with Germany because of the submarine. It starts with the *Lusitania,* devotes much space to the *Arabic, Ancona,* and *Persia,* emphasizes the *Sussex,* reaches its real culmination in the dismissal of Bernstorff. A chapter is devoted to controversies with Great Britain, and Lansing gives full weight to the irritation and resentment caused by Allied interference with neutral trade; but our quarrel with the Allies is overshadowed in his book, as it was in his mind at the time, by German attacks upon American lives and ships.

Mr. Lansing not merely admits, he insists upon, his intense sympathy for the cause of the Allies. He was always convinced of the danger of a German victory to the future of America and as early as July, 1915, felt that the time might come when America would have to cast neutrality aside to prevent German success or even a stalemate. "I hate the horrors of war but I hate worse the horrors of German mastery." It does not appear that he ever succeeded in winning President Wilson to this conviction. Certainly after the refusal of the Allies, in the spring of 1916, to accept the House-Grey memorandum it was clear that Wilson was more than ever determined to avoid intervention. As late as January 28, 1917, Lansing writes of "the natural resistance of the President" to the thought of war. Nor did Lansing's personal sympathies appear to have affected the general policy of neutrality adopted by Wilson before Lansing became Secretary of State: a policy of prolonged negotiation with the Allies over infraction of neutral rights and of immediate opposition to Germany's unrestricted use of the submarine. Lansing was too much the lawyer not to lay the foundation for a case for damages against the Allies, no matter how much he might believe they were fighting our cause. Unlike Page he refused to yield legal rights in order to win the good will of the British. He was too loyal an official to attempt to force Wilson's hand in the matter of intervention against Germany. If he urged that diplomatic relations be broken in the spring of 1916, after the sinking of the *Sussex,* it was because he followed the same line of reasoning as that taken by Wilson himself in January, 1917. It is clear that Lansing

did his best to avoid active trouble with the Allies and that he was opposed to a surrender of rights of Americans on the high seas that might have avoided the quarrel with Germany. But as a positive force his influence upon Wilson, from his own account, cannot be regarded as a factor in our entrance into the war.

Historically the *Memoirs* are important because they present a point of view relating to the maintenance of neutral rights which was almost universal among leaders of opinion as far west as the Mississippi, and one which the present younger generation finds difficulty in understanding. Mr. Lansing's attitude toward Germany was typical of an influential class. As a source book it is unfortunate that the *Memoirs* give so much space to documents now elsewhere in print; that so little is said about the earlier aspects of the attempts at American mediation and nothing about the problem of war loans. On the other hand, the excerpts from the Lansing diaries, which include records of numerous conversations with Wilson as well as with foreign diplomatists, if they do not affect general historical conclusions, are of the first importance in their illumination of manifold details.

Yale University. CHARLES SEYMOUR.

SHORTER NOTICES

Historical Bibliographies: a Systematic and Annotated Guide. By Edith M. Coulter, Associate Professor, School of Librarianship, University of California, and Melanie Gerstenfeld, Bibliographer, Hoover War Library, Stanford University. With a Foreword by Herbert Eugene Bolton. (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1935, pp. xii, 206, $2.50.) This is an excellent book, and a useful one. It reflects the happy combination of thorough training in the methods of the librarian and those of the historian. The volume will be of great service to bibliographers; general readers will find it helpful; students of history will discover it to be indispensable. Herre's *Quellenkunde* and Langlois's *Manuel* are still of service, but they are long out of date; the more recent *Guide to Historical Literature* edited by Dutcher, Shipman, and others does not solve the problem of historical bibliographies. Therefore the present volume fills a definite need. It is logically planned, catholic in scope, and thoroughly abreast of current scholarship.

There is an introductory section for general bibliographies. Historical bibliographies proper are classified largely by continent, with subdivisions for the various countries. There are, however, certain specific groupings of titles according to period, or lists arranged under a restricted number of accepted subject classifications, such as Voyages and Travels, Discovery and Exploration. The excellent index must be consulted if the manual is to be used with the best results. In order to avoid repetition titles are cited usually only under one category, the index furnishing the necessary cross references.

The difficult task of selecting from the wealth of periodical literature

those titles most helpful for current bibliography has been successfully accomplished. Every scholar will wish to make certain additions and possibly certain deletions. He will, however, find nothing of major importance omitted. The choice of *Le Moyen Age* for No. 100 is unfortunate. Furthermore, the critical note there appended refers rather to the second, than to the third series, which is in progress. The "Bulletin bibliographique: Histoire économique et juridique" which appears as an annual supplement to the *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* should be included somewhere. These comments are of minor importance. As Professor Bolton says in his foreword, this volume will be welcomed by both the novice and the veteran. It should be called to the attention of the graduate student of history early in his career; his mentors will wish it ever near at hand.

Princeton University. GRAY C. BOYCE.

Codex quartus Sancti Iacobi de expedimento et conversione Yspanie et Gallecie editus a Beato Turpino archiepiscopo. Edited by Ward Thoron. (Cambridge, The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1934.) This text of Turpin's *Chronicle,* which is more famous in song than in history, is that of the Vatican Codex C 128, which contains what would seem to be a complete copy of the Codex Calixtinus, or *Book of St. James* pertaining to the cathedral library at Compostella. The Vatican MS. has been collated with another copy, B.M. Additional MS. 12213, and the two examples were found to be "in singular agreement". The evidence indicates that both "were carefully made from the original manuscript at Compostella". It is difficult to understand, however, why the editor did not collate the Vatican MS. with the archetype instead of with a transcript of it, although it is evident that both MSS. were carefully made from the original at Compostella. This omission, though, is a venial sin compared with the fact that Mr. Thoron has been content with merely publishing the text (which considering that it only differs from the B.M. in trivial details seems hardly worth the publishing) and has made no effort to study the important historical questions to which the work gives rise. For whether the *Chronicle* was first composed for the edification of pilgrims going to Compostella, as Bédier thinks (*Les légendes épiques,* III, 44), or even earlier for the purpose of stimulating the Spanish crusades (as some have surmised), or to promote the canonization of Charlemagne, are vital historical problems yet unsolved. Mr. Thoron has missed not only an interesting subject, but it would seem also that he has failed in an essential duty of a historian. He has not taken his work seriously. "The purpose of this edition", he writes in a brief concluding page, "is to supply scholars with a text to *play* with", and "the reproductions have been added for the *amusement* of the paleographers". And why does he spell this last word as he does? The dipthongic spelling of this word is used in every other publication of the Mediaeval Academy, to which the syllable 'ae' is as sacred as the geese in ancient Rome.

The Kingdom of the Crusaders. By Dana C. Munro. (New York, D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935, pp. ix, 216, $3.00.) The reader closes this little book (it can be read through easily in an afternoon) with a feeling of regret, the regret which comes from looking at the sketch for a masterpiece which the artist never carried into execution. The marks of the master are here, the sureness of touch, the breadth of view, the indications of extensive knowledge drawn from the sources, but in a series of popular lectures he had no opportunity to do more than outline the subject clearly and with vivid touches. There was not even the occasion for an effort at brilliant, interpretative synthesis, such as has been possible for a few other Lowell lecturers in the past. The point of view which Munro and his school held as to the Crusades was already well known and awaited elaboration. We must continue to regret that the author of this book did not live to complete the extensive and thorough study for which he was so well prepared.

In some respects the history of the Latin Kingdom is really of secondary importance in the history of crusading. This warrants a discussion, such as the present one, which largely ignores the great European expeditions (except the first), and devotes itself to the phases of colonial life and politics which developed in Syria. Some parts of the discussion were already available from Munro's pen. The chapter on the "Establishment of the Kingdom" (one of the best) had already been published in the *Sewanee Review* in 1924, the year these lectures were delivered. The chapter on "Relations between Crusaders and Natives" will be found to be supplementary to the articles on "Christian and Infidel in the Holy Land", which appeared in 1901 in the *International Monthly*. Indeed the earlier treatment has the advantage of being more extensive and informing. In large part we find here a tale of feudal and ecclesiastical politics, the contention of ambitious rivals who came crusading to seek their fortunes, the competition of baron and prelate as to who should be first in this Christian kingdom. The story is somewhat complicated but Munro makes it easy to follow showing, as he does, how much of the rivalry dates from the first conquering expedition and the period prior to the capture of Jerusalem. By closing the narrative with the real end of the kingdom, Saladin's recovery of the Holy City, the most confusing and least instructive period of crusader politics is omitted. The final chapter on the "Importance of the Kingdom of the Crusaders" attempts to sum up the results of the crusading movement in both East and West, indicating the different scholarly theories on the influences exerted and warning against reaching too definite conclusions.

College teachers will find this book useful for undergraduate classes.

Williams College. RICHARD A. NEWHALL.

Le Rhin: Problèmes d'histoire et d'économie. Par Albert Demangeon, professeur à la Sorbonne, et Lucien Febvre, professeur au Collège de France.

(Paris, Armand Colin, 1935, pp. xii, 304, 26 fr.). The Rhine, even more than the Danube, deserves to be considered the most important river in the world from the standpoint of international relations. It has a double importance, as a historic frontier of political division, and as a channel of commerce uniting the rich agricultural and mineral resources of the nations of its basin. Most studies of the Rhine in history from Caesar to Oncken have been interested mainly in the political side; the present volume, while devoting an approximately equal space to the political and economic aspects of the question, really contains more of interest for the geographer than for the historian.

Nevertheless there is much interest, if little novelty, in the authors' comments on the flow of history down the swift currents of the river. They reject the nationalistic mysticism in both France and Germany which made the river the "natural boundary" or, in more ambitious moments (in the spirit of Arndt's phrase, "Germany's river, but not Germany's limit!"), the "living heart" of either nation. To them the Rhine is simply an artery of trade to which chance events of history have lent a political significance. It is unsound to look for modern France in the wandering tribes of barbarian Franks and still more to read modern Germany in the organized anarchy of the Holy Roman Empire; history is no "fancy dress ball" (p. 58)! More important were the influence of the Church, expressed in the dominant archbishoprics of the Rhine, and the particularism of the petty city republics which rose by trade. France, integrated sooner than Germany, absorbed some of these petty states and reached the Rhine as a frontier, but did not stop there—Napoleon carried French influence to the other bank. The Prussians, a people naturally very alien to the more liberal Germans of the Rhineland, had a footing in this region and desired to strengthen it. The Napoleonic Wars gave them the lower Rhine and the Franco-Prussian War the upper Rhine, and possession of the Rhineland gave Prussia industrial greatness. Westphalia and Rhenish Prussia more than doubled their population and increased sevenfold their output of coal between the Franco-Prussian and World wars (p. 146). If peace is ever to come to this much contested region, it will come only from considering the Rhine as a bond of union, an open road to ideas and trade, rather than as a racial frontier; with this moral the book closes. There is a brief bibliography but no index.

The University of Michigan. PRESTON SLOSSON.

Deux féodaux: Bourgogne et Bretagne, 1363–1491. Par B. A. Pocquet du Haut-Jussé. (Paris, Boivin, 1935, pp. 138, 10 fr.) The author himself refers to his study as "cette trop longue et trop austère revue d'un siècle et demi d'histoire", and the reviewer's first impulse is to agree with this characterization. In setting forth in chronological order the political relations between the two ducal governments he seems merely to have brought together a considerable amount of information already easily accessible, and

to have presented it without much effort at interpretation. On second thought, however, we realize that previous studies of the long struggle between king and baron have usually approached the subject from the national, royal angle. The attempt, therefore, to set forth the situation from the local and ducal point of view has an element of value and novelty. This is a more difficult approach because it emphasizes and multiplies the political complications, many of which are hard to explain clearly for want of adequate information. It also tends to re-emphasize the influence of personalities upon policies and the course of politics. One is left with the impression that the none too competent Breton dukes were weak for lack of any policy beyond maintenance of the feudal *status quo*, while the more showy Burgundians courted disaster by attempting too many things at once.

Williams College. RICHARD A. NEWHALL.

The Fane Fragment of the 1461 Lords' Journal. By William Huse Dunham, jr., Assistant Professor of History in Yale University. [Yale Historical Publications.] (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1935, pp. 108, $3.00.) This fragment is but a sixteenth or early seventeenth century copy of a damaged original. It consists of only four folios. Yet from a close study of its form and content the editor has been able to make a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the fifteenth century Lords' journals. He has proved beyond a doubt that this is the fragment described by Sir Robert Cotton as the only known journal before the reign of Henry VIII (*Cottoni Posthuma,* 1672 ed.). Cotton dated the fragment 1497. From his study of the document Professor Dunham is convinced that it can be the journal of no other than the Parliament of 1461. The real beginning of the Lord's journals he puts even earlier. He finds the origin not in the Rolls of Parliament as some have supposed but in the register of the council which was a record of attendance. By 1461 this record of attendance had reached a second stage. It is still a list of members with dots opposite the names of those present; there are two columns, the second regularly reserved for the barons as is the first for those of higher rank. The change is in the second column; it has been lowered in order to make room for memoranda. By the time of Henry VIII a third stage of development had been reached, that of allowing a third column for the memoranda. Brief as are the memoranda in this 1461 journal they are sufficient to add to our scant knowledge of fifteenth century procedure. We find that the Lords freely amended Commons bills, that some bills were read at least three times, that there was debate, and that bills were committed.

Wells College. FRANCES H. RELF.

Le XVI^e siècle. Par Henri Sée, professeur honoraire à l'Université de Rennes, et Armand Rebillon, professeur à la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Rennes. Avant-Propos de S. Charléty, recteur de l'Université de Paris. ["Clio": Introduction aux études historiques, 6.] (Paris, Les Presses

Universitaires de France, 1935, pp. xxiii, 410, 35 fr.) Here is a book that shows an excellent combination of conservatism and the spirit of progress. It is conservative because it holds fast to the best standards of careful, scientific history. It is progressive because, along with other books in the same series, it aims to provide for French university students something new—a textbook giving a brief survey of the subject. Hitherto it has been a tradition in the universities of France, and other countries, that history students should glean their general knowledge from the sources and monumental works. With the great increase in the number of such materials this tradition has become impracticable, and the authors of this volume have wisely and skillfully provided an introduction to the facts and bibliography of sixteenth century history. The bibliographies are unusually well selected and up to date. One of the best features is a discussion at the end of each chapter of the *État actuel des questions*. For example, a résumé is given both of Max Weber's theory that capitalism was a product of Calvinism and of the refutation of it by later investigators. In this respect Sée and Rebillon have set a good example for other writers.

Political events, party strife, and economic developments occupy the main interests of the authors. Since they assume an elementary knowledge of the period by the reader their book will have little value for undergraduate students in America, but for graduate students is might be exactly the thing which teachers have long been seeking. The weakest part of the book is the hasty treatment of the Renaissance in the sixteenth century. Another imperfection is the lack of any system of maps. Here and there serious omissions have been made in the bibliographies; for example, there is no mention of the best edition of Luther's correspondence by Enders and others, of *A Guide to Historical Literature*, or of the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*. Finally, the work might be improved by eliminating a tendency to talk about topics such as the Renaissance, Humanism, Anabaptism, and Machiavellianism, without telling what they are.

Ohio Wesleyan University. HASTINGS EELLS.

Der deutsche Bauernkrieg: Aktenband. Von Günther Franz. (Munich, R. Oldenbourg, 1935, pp. 445, 12 M.) The publication of this substantial *Aktenband* will add greatly to the usefulness of Dr. Franz's excellent history of the German Peasants' War, published nearly two years ago. The delay in bringing out the second volume is of small importance in a work that will probably not be superseded for many years to come, but the present reviewer cannot help regretting that these illuminating documents were not at hand when he first followed Dr. Franz through the intricacies of *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg*. Aside from the value of the documents themselves, this second volume supplies for the first time a much needed index to both names and subjects. The latter, which is very complete, is of special interest as the author has contrived with considerable ingenuity to make it serve as a glos-

sary of obsolete legal terminology and of those peasant expressions which can no longer be found in the average German dictionary.

The contents of the *Aktenband* is made up almost entirely of the lists of grievances drawn up by the peasants in different parts of Germany. The majority of these come from the period of the Peasants' War, but there are also a number dating from those earlier peasant risings to which Dr. Franz rightly gave so much attention in the first part of his history. Of the sources for the early revolts, however, only those that express the "Kampf um das alte Recht" are included, since the documents relating to the "Bundschuh" have already been published and Dr. Franz has limited his work to unpublished sources. For the same reason he has omitted the material published some time ago in his *Akten zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges in Mitteldeutschland* as well as any appearing in other special collections.

The value of these "Beschwerdeschriften" is obvious. They serve much the same purpose for the history of Germany in the early sixteenth century as do the *cahiers* of the Third Estate for the history of France in the period of the Revolution. They shed a direct light on the social problems of their day, for they tell us what the usually inarticulate peasant thought and what he wanted. Coming mostly from small communities, they are full of specific, local grievances. They furnish all the materials for a detailed picture of the more vexatious side of the peasants' life. In addition, as the author points out with pardonable pride, they should be of considerable interest to the student of German feudal law, folklore, or language.

New York University. WALLACE K. FERGUSON.

The Expedition of the Florentines to Chios, 1599, described in Contemporary Diplomatic Reports and Military Dispatches. Edited with an Introduction by Philip P. Argenti. (London, John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1934, pp. xl, 228, 12*s.* 6*d.*) This book is the author's fourth publication of sources relating to the history of Chios. The attempt to take Chios from the Turks is not only interesting in itself, but is typical of the scores of raids made during the sixteenth century by the Italians in the eastern Mediterranean. Most of the documents pertaining to this unsuccessful expedition of 1599 are from Tuscan archives, particularly from the Archivio Mediceo, although Viennese archives and the English Public Record Office have also been used. The documents are divided into three parts: those relating to the first expedition to Chios in 1599, those relating to a projected second expedition, and those relating to the negotiations for the liberation of captured and enslaved Florentines. While Mr. Argenti seems to place too much confidence in handwriting and position in files as aids to chronology, he has in general fulfilled his duties as editor carefully.

In his introduction Mr. Argenti gives a most interesting account of the failure of the Florentines based entirely upon the contemporary evidence he has edited. The Turkish historians, the Greek chroniclers, and even the rec-

ords of the Chiote monastery of St. Nicholas to be found in Justinian's *Scio Sacra,* have not been used. Nor is the rather detailed description of the attack upon Chios to be found in Fulvio Fontana's *I Pregi della Toscana,* Florence, 1701, taken into consideration, although Mr. Argenti reprints two valuable engravings which illustrate Fontana's account. Yet Fontana as historian of the Florentine military order of the Cavalieri di Santo Stefano may have had access to sources which have since disappeared. Mr. Argenti indicates that the Cavalieri di Santo Stefano played an important role in the expedition, but does not make it clear that the expedition was wholly the project of this aristocratic military order controlled by the Duke of Florence. The sources refer without ambiguity to all five of the boats sailing for Chios as "le galere di Santo Stefano" (document 50, p 82). In speculating concerning the motives for the attack, Mr. Argenti thinks entirely in terms of military glory and immediate booty. It is quite possible, however, that the mastic and alum which came from Chios and its vicinity lent additional charm to the plan.

Western Reserve University. PALMER A. THROOP.

The England of Charles II. By Arthur Bryant. (New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1935, pp. xv, 202, $2.00.) From the wealth of knowledge drawn from his lives of Charles II and of Samuel Pepys, Mr. Bryant has painted for us a portrait of the England of their time in brilliant colors and sharp perspective. It is the sort of social history which made Macaulay's third chapter and the opening pages of Lecky and Trevelyan such entertaining and informing reading. It is, as Mr. Bryant says, a "far country" to which he takes us; and it is not part of his purpose to tell us much of its history or of its politics, or to explain what its people were thinking about. For its materials he has relied, he tells us, on the Shakerley MSS., on the transcription of which he has spent the last ten years, and which, by implication, he seems to promise some day to publish. To that time all students of the Restoration must look forward impatiently. Meanwhile they may be grateful for this pageant of England, full of life and color and intimate detail of daily living. It is an entertaining and an informing book, though it lacks two things which one would like to see from such a hand. The one is an account, however brief, of how this country was managed politically—not the details which he gives of the machinery but the meaning and direction of government. The other is what it wrote and read. That is an ungracious criticism; and the unfairest; for of all unfair criticism the worst is to blame an author for what he does not pretend to do. Yet in a sense it is in this case the highest praise; for it reveals that one leaves the feast unsatisfied. The courses were so good that one wishes there were more. And "is life not more than meat and body than raiment?"

Harvard University. W. C. ABBOTT.

Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, relating to English Affairs, existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in other Libraries of Northern Italy. Edited by Allen B. Hinds, M. A. Volume XXXV, *1666-1668.* (London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1935, pp. lvi, 433, £1 10*s*.) Volume XXXV of the Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, covers the period from June, 1666, to December, 1668, and consists in considerable part of dispatches by the two Venetian representatives in England, the secretary Marchesini, who went to England in June, 1668, and the ambassador Mocenigo, who served from August, 1668, onwards. Mocenigo was a fully accredited resident ambassador, the first to serve at the English court since the dismissal of Giavarina in 1663.

Comment on English affairs during the period June, 1666, to June, 1668, came chiefly from Giustinian and Belegno who were respectively ambassadors in France and Spain. The one had as his chief subject for discussion the second Dutch war, and the negotiations for the treaty of Breda, the other the negotiations for the treaty between Spain and Portugal in 1668, which England helped to arrange. At the hands of these men the affairs of England proper had little direct treatment, except in such a matter as Continental news of the sea fighting during the second Dutch war. One statement of importance which is made in this connection has enabled Mr. Hinds to set side by side in contradiction the opinions of Giustinian and of Sir Julian Corbett concerning the opening of the Four Days or North Foreland battle of 1666. What Corbett calls a brilliantly conceived attack Giustinian describes as a disorderly enterprise in which the English gave evidence of "their unbridled arrogance, their lunatic haughtiness, and their overweening pride".

The dispatches from London add little to the existing knowledge of English affairs during the latter half of 1668. The chief purpose of the ambassador was to gain English support in the struggle between Venice and the Turk, and particularly to persuade the English to serve as mediators. The interplay between Mocenigo who was continually requesting help, and Charles who was declaring his good intentions and his poverty show diplomacy in its most solemn and sterile form. How deep was the knowledge of the Venetians concerning English affairs may be learned from the sad comment of Marchesini. He said of Charles that the king was favorable to the plans of Venice, "but his authority and power are not absolute, from what I gather".

Mr. Hinds has supplied a full index to the calendar, which occupies almost one fourth of the volume. His notes principally serve to identify persons who are mentioned in the documents. His introduction is a simple digest of the information in the calendar, and makes few distinctions. Thus, for example, Giustinian's report that the loss by the burning of the Dutch fleet at Vlie was nineteen millions is not explained in terms of the common estimate that it was one million pounds.

Cornell University. FREDERICK GEORGE MARCHAM.

The Rediscovery of John Wesley. By George Croft Cell, Professor of Historical Theology in Boston University. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1935, pp. xviii, 420, $2.50.) The antithesis "Calvinism *vs.* Arminianism" has undoubtedly cost a vast amount of misunderstanding of religious history. It has validity, in fact, only on the basis of a special, narrow interpretation of both terms. In 1923 Professor H. D. Foster, in the *Harvard Theological Review,* showed that Arminius and the Remonstrants stood nearer to Calvin than their opponents. Professor Cell, without alluding to Foster's useful study, here attempts to clear up the prevailing errors in another area of the same general field.

This impressive book represents the results of more than a quarter century of research in Wesley sources. The author contends that Wesley's significance lies in his rediscovery and reaffirmation of the faith of the first Reformers against the indifferentism of his age, and that in this renewal of original Protestantism he leaned rather to Calvin than to Luther. Incidentally Cell makes it clear that the great evangelist was also a capable and widely read theologian.

A profound admirer of Wesley, our author is at the same time anxious to dissociate him from present-day humanism, and shows a strong tendency to identify his teachings with those of the crisis theology. For Wesley's contemporaries the crisis lay in the rationalist exposure of the bankruptcy of the Christianity then currently professed. His own crisis, his conversion of 1738—which, Cell argues against Piette, was really determinative—is explained as in no sense a reaction against Calvinism but rather a repudiation of lax Anglican Arminianism. Wesley also rejected "mysticism", and censured Luther for a "taint of mysticism". Advocating "no holiness but a social holiness" he saw in mysticism a fellowship denying individualism, out of accord with his feeling for the church as a communion. In the spirit of Calvin he called for "social, open, active Christians", and confidently advanced toward social progress and reform. The real issue between him and the extreme Calvinists was over his doctrine of holiness, here described as "the Catholic appreciation of the progressive imitation of Christ". The last of the sixteen chapters treats ably enough, but with too much recognition of Weber's defective thesis, the economic aspects of the subject.

A rather excessive argumentativeness, a tendency to repetition, and some weakness in definition of terms, together with a few startling misprints (*e.g.,* "paradigms" twice for "paragons") mar a little the general value of this unique study of Wesley, which, in the present reviewer's judgment, is nine tenths right in its historical interpretation. The thesis would have been clarified, and made more acceptable to the average reader, if the eighteenth century uses of the term "Calvinism" and "Arminianism" had been fully explained early in the book.

The University of Chicago. JOHN T. MCNEILL.

Briefwisseling en Aanteekeningen van Willem Bentinck, Heer van Rhoon, tot aan de Dood van Willem IV, 22 October, 1751. Uitgegeven door Prof. Dr. C. Gerretson and Prof. Dr. P. Geyl. Deel I, *Tot aan de Praeliminairen van Aken, 30 April, 1748.* [Historisch Genootschap.] (Utrecht, Kemink and Son, 1934, pp. x, 499.) In their preface the editors of this volume call attention to the dispersal of the carefully preserved papers of Willem Bentinck, Heer van Rhoon en Pendrecht, and their subsequent recovery by the industry of later generations. That portion which found a place in the Huisarchief at The Hague through purchase by King William I was published by T. Bussemaker in *Archives de la Maison d'Orange Nassau* (ser. IV, 1908 ff.). Another large portion came to rest in the Egerton MSS. in the British Museum. This was known to Bussemaker and analyzed by him, but a rule of the Huisarchief forced him to forego printing it with The Hague documents. Its publication is here commenced. Inevitably, as the editors are at pains to indicate, it is fragmentary, and of value chiefly as a supplement to the papers previously printed.

The present volume extends from September, 1736, to April, 1748. Within the first decade letters from Bentinck to his mother, the Countess of Portland, constitute the bulk of the items. They treat lightly of a variety of topics, chiefly relating to incidents in Dutch politics with which Bentinck was closely connected. They demonstrate his known aversion for France, his discontent with the political uncertainties produced by the absence of a stadholder in the United Provinces, and his devotion to a policy which should result in the closest possible association between Great Britain and the Netherlands. His allusions to the difficulty of producing common action on the part of allies recalls similar troubles in the days of Marlborough.

In the correspondence from 1746 to 1748 more significant items appear, notably with respect to the Revolution of 1747 which gave the Netherlands a stadholder and captain general drawn from the House of Orange. As an Orange partisan Bentinck played a prominent role in these events, although references to them, while useful, are at best incidental in nature. In his exchange of letters with English statesmen there is further evidence from both sides of the Channel of continued friction between allies, and of efforts to reduce it in the common interest. The increasing importance of Bentinck's role in the Netherlands is also clearly indicated.

The volume ends on the note of preparation for the assembly of European diplomats at Aachen. A second volume is promised which will carry the correspondence to the death of William IV, and will, since Bentinck was one of those who negotiated the peace, be of greater value than this which, of necessity, is preliminary. Identification of persons and events is effected with painstaking accuracy, and an index is promised in the second volume. Reference to the correspondence already in print is omitted, a fact which

can occasion only small regret since this volume dovetails with that of Bussemaker.

Brown University. ROBERT H. GEORGE.

The Exploration of the Pacific. By J. C. Beaglehole. [The Pioneer Histories, edited by V. T. Harlow and J. A. Williamson.] (London, A. and C. Black; New York, Macmillan Company, 1934, pp. xv, 410, $5.00.) The seventh of the Pioneer Histories successfully carries on the purpose of the series to combine a scholarly mastery of source material with a presentation sufficiently broad and interesting to appeal to the general reader. The author does not set out to discuss political or economic rivalries in the Pacific area; he deliberately says little of the exploration of the shore lines of the Pacific; nor does his volume "do what any final book on the subject must do, and discuss the story from the native standpoint as well as the European" (p. xi). The narrative deals chiefly with the opening up of the scattered island world of the Pacific, a process to which the unavailing search for a vast and populous and presumably civilized *Terra Australis incognita* gives a considerable degree of unity. The voyages of Magellan, Mendaña, Quiros, Torres, Tasman, Dampier, Bougainville, Cook, and others only less famous are described in sufficient detail to make clear the physical difficulties faced, the motives behind the various expeditions, and something of the nature of the contacts established with various types of islanders. The volume should interest geographers, students of European expansion, and all who from their armchairs like to fare in imagination in the company of men who follow the allurements and brave the dangers of the unknown.

The University of Chicago. ARTHUR P. SCOTT.

Pages choisies de Babeuf. Par Maurice Dommanget. [Les classiques de la Révolution française, publiés sous la direction d'Albert Mathiez et Georges Lefebvre.] (Paris, Armand Colin, 1935, pp. xi, 330, 35 fr.) In 1907, Professor G. P. Gooch wrote: "It is in the socialist movement that the operation of the ideas promulgated by the French Revolution is most clearly traceable at the present time." The ideas and plans of Babeuf thus assume major importance, for, with his conspiracy, "socialism ceased to be merely a speculative doctrine and became a political program". The decision to include selections from his writings in the "Classics" series originated with Mathiez, although he himself was apparently inclined to regard the communism of Babeuf more in the light of a mere expedient rather than a well-considered and settled conviction. M. Dommanget dissents from this view. He presents evidence to prove that communism formed the basis of Babeuf's thinking even before 1789. He was a Picard and the origin of his communism is traced, not only to the philosophy of the eighteenth century, but to the social solidarity and community interests of the peasants on the plains

of Picardy. In the end, of course, he went beyond their desires in advocating the suppression of private property. The present volume will be welcomed by students of socialism and the French Revolution for two reasons. In the first place it contains the best bibliography on Babeuf and his Society of Equals with which this reviewer is acquainted. Most of the works listed are to be found either in the Bibliothèque nationale or the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute of Moscow. Then, the selections included are well chosen, and in many cases from rare and unpublished sources.

The State University of Iowa. GEORGE GORDON ANDREWS.

Un colonial sous la Révolution en France et en Amérique: Moreau de Saint-Méry. Par Anthony Louis Elicona, Columbia University, Docteur de l'Université de Paris. (Paris, Jouve and Company, 1934, pp. 271.) Students of the Napoleonic Era probably remember Moreau de Saint-Méry for his defense of his own cause before the Emperor: "Sire, je ne vous demande point de récompenser ma probité; je demande seulement qu'elle soit tolérée. Ne craignez rien, cette maladie n'est pas contagieuse: la reconnaissance est la fleur des tombeaux". Students of the French Revolution, however, have reason for remembering him more clearly, and therefore doubtless will be grateful to M. Elicona for having provided a full-length portrait of their charming old friend.

M. Elicona's interest in French travelers in the United States caused him to write of Moreau de Saint-Méry who, he states in his preface, is the only one among the most important of these "figures d'écrivains voyageurs" not the object of a complete biography. Furthermore, because of "la variété de ses experiences, l'étendue de ses travaux, le charme de sa personnalité, Moreau de Saint-Méry mérite d'être sauvé de l'oubli historique".

The story, as told by M. Elicona, is familiar in its general outlines. Born on the island of Martinique in 1750, Moreau de Saint-Méry early went to Paris, studied law, and then returned to his native island to follow his chosen vocation. After some experience in local politics, he again journeyed to France where he was commissioned to study the legislation of the French colonies. Out of this work grew his great contribution to French history, six volumes on the laws and constitutions of the French colonies in America. From 1789 to 1793 he was occupied with Freemasonry, Parisian politics, the Constituent Assembly (in which he represented Martinique and ably debated colonial problems and the slave trade), and the *conseil judiciaire*.

Forced into exile in 1793, he sought and found a haven in Philadelphia, where he opened a bookshop, became active in the local French circles, and collected the information which he later incorporated in his famous journal. Back in France in 1798, he became historiographer to the navy, a councilor of state, and an adviser in the drafting of the new colonial code. After an unhappy experience as an administrator in the Italian duchies, he lived in ob-

security, saved from poverty by a small gratuity from his distant kinswoman, the Empress Josephine, and by a gift and a pension from Louis XVIII.

As a convenient and conscientious, though not very critical, synthesis, this volume should prove useful to students, especially in the field of Franco-American relations or French colonial history. But as a specimen of historical writing it savors too strongly of the graduate seminar.

Western Reserve University. JOHN HALL STEWART.

Zachary Macaulay: his Part in the Movement for the Abolition of the Slave Trade and of Slavery. An Appreciation by Charles Booth. (New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1934, pp. 119, $2.40.) This is a somewhat belated review of a small but excellent book. It is remarkable how much distinguished ability as well as moral devotion gathered around the movement for the abolition of the British slave trade and slavery. Perhaps it was because it came so early in the series of great modern reforms, perhaps because it was independent both of political parties and of that conflict of social classes that made united effort in propaganda for social reform so difficult, perhaps because the slave trade was in itself an anachronism; whatever the cause, the advocates of its abolition were almost all men of distinction in ability and position. Less conspicuous than Wilberforce, Clarkson, and Fox in the movement, Zachary Macaulay was nevertheless in his experience, persistence, good sense, and effectiveness scarcely less important than any of them.

His connection with slavery and the slave trade was highly practical. As a young Scotsman seeking his fortune in the West Indies he spent four years, between 1785 and 1789, as clerk and overseer on a sugar plantation in Jamaica, and gained there a permanent and deep-seated hatred of Negro slavery. He was sent out to Sierra Leone with the first group of administrators of that colony for free blacks established in the midst of slave trading stations, and when he became its governor in 1794 he already knew all aspects of the slave trade. The appalling difficulties of the African settlement did not disillusion him but rather nerved him, after his return to England in 1799, to take an active part in the long struggle that led to the abolition of the trade in 1807 and of slavery itself in 1833. His gifted descendants, Lord Macaulay, Sir George Otto and George Macaulay Trevelyan, Lord Denman, and several prominent officials in the civil service, are a striking instance of one of those English family groups who until the rise of democracy, indeed since, have given much of its shape to English society and government.

This is an unpretentious book, merely an "appreciation", as it calls itself, but it gives a welcome and vivid glimpse of an interesting personality and into an important modern movement of reform.

The University of Pennsylvania. EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

Queen Victoria. By E. F. Benson. (New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1935, pp. 406, $3.50.) Mr. Benson offers the reading world at large a pleasant antidote to the acid of Strachey. He does not aim at novelty of any kind; but he achieves a charming conventionality. He offers a flowing narrative, presented through a skillful choice of anecdotes and a very happy style. He treats the queen with gentle humor and broad tolerance, but still with honesty. His very lack of animus makes the evidence as to her faults the more telling. One's sympathy with Gladstone is profound. And yet one asks whether things could have been otherwise. Victoria's heritage was not one to impart the qualities she lacked; nor did she, at any period of her life, know much of softening influences.

But while the reading world at large should be more than content, subscribers to historical reviews (for whom Mr. Benson did *not* write) may find room to be critical. It does not matter so much that a reviewer's pencil might tick off a fair number of inaccuracies, or that some major problems of the time are unsatisfactorily stated. These deficiencies can easily be remedied. What does matter is that much of a historian's curiosity about Victoria will remain unsatisfied. As in earlier biographies, one reads of her relationships with Melbourne, Palmerston (as foreign minister), Disraeli and Gladstone; but practically nothing of those with Russell, Palmerston (as premier), Granville, and Salisbury. And her attitude at some great crises is undefined. Considering how deep were her convictions, and how broad her influence, even a brief biography might indicate how she felt and acted concerning the revolutions of 1848, and the social and political convulsions which grew out of them. There is no lack of material. But Mr. Benson stops only to note Louis Philippe's dethronement and exile, and Victoria's sympathy, before describing lengthily the emotions evoked in her by Prince Albert's successful promotion of the exhibition of 1851. The omission is unfortunate. For a knowledge of the conflicts with the foreign secretary to which the queen's convictions, and her passion for interfering in foreign policy, gave rise is almost essential to an understanding of her personality, her mentality, and her relation to domestic as well as to international politics. There are other striking omissions of this kind. Moreover, the comparatively narrow range of Mr. Benson's reading (even the prince consort's published letters would seem to have been ignored) has apparently caused him to lose sight of some influences affecting the queen's development. Thus, in the opinion of contemporaries well qualified to speak, the early growth of Victoria's and Prince Albert's conviction that they could form better judgments than the Whig ministers regarding foreign policy, owed much to the coincidence of their views with those of Aberdeen and Peel, and to the complaisance, not to say subservience, with which those ministers treated them. But such fault-finding is hardly fair to the author of a popular biography, and especially to

one who has produced a very delightful, fundamentally truthful, and quite useful book.

Wesleyan University. HERBERT C. F. BELL.

The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church: its Origins and Outcome. By Alec R. Vidler, Priest of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd, Formerly Exhibitioner of Selwyn College. [The Norrisian Prize Essay in the University of Cambridge for the Year 1933.] (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1934, pp. xiii, 286, $4.50.) Modernism as an issue in the Roman Catholic Church is dead and buried. Anyone whose personal predilections impel him in that direction can cherish the belief that many priests secretly hold the opinions which are explicitly renounced by all who are required to subscribe to the anti-modernist oath, but this is pure speculation unsupported by any evidence worthy of consideration. If so liberal a scholar as Dr. Karl Adam writing from the Catholic point of view can assert in his *Spirit of Catholicism* that the anti-modernist encyclical of 1907, *Pascendi,* does not forbid the historico-critical method of Biblical study but rather presupposes it, he can do so only by explaining, in the same paragraph, that the Church guards against the abuse of this method by requiring that it shall find its "final norm and standard" in the living tradition of the Church itself—that it to say, so far as this question is concerned, in the decisions of the Biblical commission; which brings us around again to the principle that historico-critical scholarship is permitted only on condition that it arrive at the answers already given by ecclesiastical authority. And so, modernism is dead.

Its rise and fall constitute, however, an episode that must be understood by all who would understand the spirit of modern Catholicism. The importance which the Church itself ascribed to it, and the magnitude of the danger that was apprehended from it, may be estimated from the weight of the artillery that was directed against it. An Anglican scholar has produced what is undoubtedly the most complete and unbiased history of that liberalizing movement within the Roman Catholic Church that was most conspicuously represented by Duchesne and Loisy in France, Tyrrell in England, Murri and Fogazzaro in Italy, and by Von Hügel (for a time) and several individually less prominent scholars in Germany. The author's sympathies are evidently with the modernists, but his work is that of a scientific student of the historical data, never that of a propagandist for or against any cause. Catholics will perhaps think that he treats the great anti-modernist encyclical of Pope Pius X with scant respect when he says that it does not give a just and fair account of what the modernists had taught and does not even attempt to do so but deliberately misrepresents them for a polemic purpose. However, he not only asserts but proves that modernism was never a system devised in the spirit of rebellion against Catholic orthodoxy and papal au-

thority, but was rather the aggregate of several independent movements, variously impelled and never integrated into a single system or program. Whatever it was, it is no more. In America it not only has no existence; it has not even a history.

The University of Chicago. W. E. GARRISON.

British Propaganda at Home and in the United States from 1914 to 1917. By James Duane Squires, Professor of History, Colby Junior College. [Harvard Historical Monographs, VI.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1935, pp. xi, 113, $1.00.) To the growing body of literature on propaganda during the World War this slender volume of eighty pages of text is a most welcome addition. Professor Squires has limited himself to a consideration of British propaganda organization and activity in England and the United States from the beginning of the war to the intervention of the United States. Within these limits he has devoted most of his attention to the propaganda bureau set up in September, 1914, by Charles F. G. Masterman at Wellington House; a center which was finally closed after its work had been taken over by the Ministry of Information, established in February, 1918. Mr. Squires discusses the activities of Wellington House in carrying on propaganda in the United States, first under Sir Gilbert Parker, the novelist, and after his resignation by Professor William Macneile Dixon of Glasgow University. The literature sent over by Wellington House between 1914 and 1917 is listed in an appendix. Only one aspect of it is submitted to analysis: propaganda dealing with Anglo-American relations. In a note (p. 69), Mr. Squires states that he has prepared an analysis of all the British materials sent to the United States, which he hopes later to develop in a larger study. The author estimates the cost of British propaganda in the last two years of the war as close to £2,000,000. He considers the work carried on in America so effective as to constitute one of the six underlying causes for the entrance of the United States into the war. The study is based chiefly on materials found in the Harvard library, supplemented by information secured from a few persons familiar with the subject. Mr. Squires has produced an excellent, brief study of an important wartime activity.

The University of Michigan. HOWARD M. EHRMANN.

Quatre ans à Rome, 1921-1926. Par Baron Beyens, ancien ambassadeur de Belgique. (Paris, Librairie Plon, 1934, pp. 306, 18 fr.) The author of *Deux années à Berlin,* which presented a picture of conditions in Germany immediately before the World War, now offers a revealing account of personages and events in Italy of the period in which he represented his country at the Vatican. For his facts and observations he has drawn upon a journal which he kept during these years.

Ministers of the United States to the Papal States, when there was diplo-

matic intercourse between the two governments, frequently remarked in their dispatches on the opportunities afforded for observation and diplomatic gossip at the Vatican. Here the Christian world passed by; and here, apart from the political schemings and designs of other European capitals, representatives of many nations talked freely and informally among themselves of outside happenings. Baron Beyens found his post similarly advantageous. And he was qualified not only to record dispassionately many phases of European politics but also to make a keen analysis of the changing situation in Italy itself.

The author's reminiscences are grouped around three heads: the death of Benedict XV, the conclave and election of Pius XI, and the first years of the latter's pontificate. With Benedict the minister successfully negotiated the detachment of the provinces of Eupen, Malmédy, and St. Vith from the episcopal jurisdiction of Cologne. In gratitude and loyalty the Catholic ambassador defends the policy of the Holy See during the War by asserting that Benedict's attitude was not one of silence and inaction when the conduct of the Central Powers deserved censure.

As an eyewitness of one of the greatest revolutions in all history Baron Beyens gives a graphic account of the coming of Fascism and the early days of Mussolini's rule. In this volume, both entertaining and informative, we have another admirable example of the contribution which a diplomatic representative, combining powers of observation with temperate judgment, can, but too rarely does make to history.

Carnegie Institution of Washington. LEO F. STOCK.

A Short History of International Affairs, 1920 to 1934. By G. M. Gathorne-Hardy. Preface by The Rt. Hon. Lord Eustace Percy, M. P. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1934, pp. x, 351, $3.00.) The debt which students of international relations have owed to the Royal Institute of International Affairs for its publication of the annual *Survey of International Affairs* and, more recently, of the annual *Documents on International Affairs* has been further increased by the publication of the volume under review. Although invaluable in themselves, the annual publications of necessity largely left to the reader the task of weaving together a connected and comprehensive account. In order that a brief history of international affairs during the past fifteen years might be available in a single volume the institute invited Mr. Gathorne-Hardy to undertake the writing of such a book. The writer's task was principally that of organization and synthesis, but in these fields he has done his work well.

Under the author's arrangement the postwar years have been grouped in three chronological periods: the Period of Settlement, 1920-1925; the Period of Fulfilment, 1925-1930; the Period of Crisis, 1930-1934. Within each division the material is presented topically. Enlightening and stimulating sur-

veys of the world in 1920, in 1925, in 1930, and in 1934 are placed at appropriate places in the volume. These brief chapters which depict and interpret the world situation in these different years constitute one of the most valuable features of the book. As the title indicates, the work is distinctly a *history* of international affairs and does not discuss, as does Simonds and Emeny's *The Great Powers in World Politics,* the foundations of international relations. Nor does it trace separately in individual chapters the foreign policy of each of the major powers for the whole postwar period. So far as this problem is concerned, it must still be solved by the student with the help of the table of contents and the rather brief index. While the author has presented the facts with a high degree of impartiality, he has not hesitated to give decided expression to his personal view when it comes to exposition and interpretation. In general, however, he has written with sympathy and with understanding of the various national viewpoints. The book should be very useful to those interested in postwar affairs. Unfortunately, it is somewhat inadequately equipped with maps and has no bibliography.

Indiana University. F. Lee Benns.

The First Social Experiments in America: a Study in the Development of Spanish Indian Policy in the Sixteenth Century. By Lewis Hanke [Harvard Historical Monographs, V.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1935, pp. xii, 99, $1.00.) This monograph is concerned with Spanish efforts between 1512 and 1535 to regulate Indian policy under theory and in practice on the islands of La Española, Puerto Rico, and Cuba. The years prior to the initial date were marked by the acceptance of the philosophy that the native was merely a "dirty dog". In theory, the problems created by the unexpected encounter of the two cultures were: Could the American natives be remnants of the Ten Lost Tribes; were they rational beings, or barbarians, or of intermediate status? Were they slaves or free by nature; could they absorb Spanish and Christian culture? In practice, could they be justly deprived of lands, be compelled to work, pay tribute, suffer branding, accept baptism, pay tithes? The whole issue of the quandary devolved upon the Spanish crown as head of the national Church, not upon the papacy; hence experiments to find the answers were undertaken to dispel the dissonance of expert opinions. In the spirit of the Laws of Burgos the crown undertook to ascertain whether any of the Indians could live independently and alone as Christian Spaniards did. Inevitably in all instances the natives reverted promptly to their original status. There had yet appeared no method of relationship as effective as the encomienda, which at least provided tasks and tutelage and had the merit of appealing to the self-interest of the settlers, whereas the methods of liberty cut their incomes and menaced their system.

The author intends the monograph to be a part of a later and larger work. In the present part his contribution consists in his survey of the theoretical

question and in presentation of some of the details of the various experiments. There are appendixes containing notes on (1) the bibliography of the Lost Tribes phantasy and (2) on opinions concerning the character of the Indians. A third gives the instructions for carrying on the "experiencia" or experiment in Cuba in 1531 and for a few years thereafter. It is interesting to see that the work makes repeated allusions to the analogous problems which today perplex the frontiers of white Christendom (so-called by sufferance); after all, modern colonization is only four hundred years old, and the burning questions are still compulsory labor and appropriation of land, while the dilemma of the conquerors between exploitation and amelioration grows in intensity with time, increased investments, and closing markets. The conflict then, comparable to that of today, was between a motherland which was intellectual, scientific, and benevolent (Spain of the 1500's was all these) and a white-dominated colony which was avid for quick wealth and had no illusions about the mental stature or spiritual profundity of the available labor supply or its prior rights to land. The subject matter of this work is covered from another angle in Simpson's *Encomienda in New Spain*.

The University of California. H. I. PRIESTLEY.

The Spanish Missions of Georgia. By John Tate Lanning. [Publications of the University of Georgia.] (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1935, pp. xiii, 321, $3.00.) This work portrays Spanish influence in Georgia a century and a half before the arrival of the English, a phase of history which has been neglected in the general histories of the United States. A thriving civilization flourished in Georgia centered in the missions, established first by the Jesuits and then by the Franciscans. Numerous, indeed, were the missions and missionaries of the Georgia coast—Spain's outposts of empire and empire builders on the Atlantic side of the continent.

The book describes the mission ruins in Georgia, Indian civilization when the padres appeared, the cold reception of the Spaniards by the natives because of the remembrance of earlier cruelties, massacres of the religious after their work was well started, the reconquest and building of new missions, the policies of the governors of Florida toward Georgia, the English intrusions and struggle for empire, the Anglo-Spanish rivalry, and the disintegration of the missions.

The work is thoroughly documented and has copious footnotes. There is a bibliography of nine pages; the manuscript material has been listed by the *legajo* numbers and not according to the title of the manuscripts. This shortens the bibliography considerably, but most historians prefer to have all the manuscripts cited listed individually in the bibliography, especially when new material is used as is the case in this account. There is an index of twenty-eight pages, an interesting map made by the author, and the drawings throughout the book are quite appropriate.

The books cited for the first time in the footnotes do not have the date and place of publication, the word *cédula* is unaccented throughout the work, the dash seems to be a favorite form of punctuation, for there is a sprinkling of dashes, the style is a little difficult and involved in some places, and certain peculiar expressions have been used, like squashed, yapped, chewed the royal decree, splotch, etc.

The author has done for the Georgia missions what certain writers have done for those of California and has brought to light a vital and little-known portion of history.

The Oklahoma College for Women. LILLIAN ESTELLE FISHER.

The French Foundations, 1680-1693. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Theodore Calvin Pease, University of Illinois, and Raymond C. Werner, University of Illinois. [Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library, French Series, Volume I.] (Springfield, Illinois State Historical Library, 1934, pp. xiv, 426, $2.50.) Save for Volume I of the Illinois Historical Collections (which for most practical reasons can be ignored) this is the first of the twenty-three volumes of source material whose contents antedate the year of British occupation, 1763. Some of the reasons for thus ignoring the French period are the extensive publications in this field of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society, and other analogous organizations. Yet the editors affirm that "by far the greatest part" of the sources for French Illinois after 1687 are still unprinted, and this initial volume is the first in a promised series to be devoted to this field.

The word "gleanings" describes as well as any the contents of the volume. This is no reflection upon their value; rather, it indicates their somewhat scrappy character. In keeping with Illinois editorial practice, the documents are grouped in seven chapters. Most of them have been drawn from originals (or copies) in such institutions as the Chicago Historical Society Library and the Newberry Library. A considerable portion of the book is devoted to reprinting notarial documents—contracts of *voyageurs,* traders' engagements, etc., preserved in the Palais de Justice at Montreal. It may be added that our American historical societies have as yet barely scratched the surface of the vast collection of source material in the Montreal archives, bearing upon their French local background.

The documents presented deal largely with the economic and business aspects of French enterprise in the upper country. Easily the gem of the collection (and to large extent an exception to the foregoing statement) is the remarkable memoir attributed to Sieur Deliette, nephew of Henry Tonty, which fills the last fourth of the volume. Coming to Illinois as a youth in 1678, and remaining for upwards of twenty years, the author had an exceptional opportunity to learn all a white man could know about the Illinois In-

dians in their primitive state. His memoir is probably without an equal for the clarity and comprehensiveness of its picture of a primitive midwestern Algonquin Indian society. The editorial equipment of the volume is competent but restrained. The statement (p. 19) that the arpent was "about 12 rods" seems not in keeping with the general editorial standard displayed.

Detroit Public Library. M. M. QUAIFE.

Diary of the Alarcón Expedition into Texas, 1718–1719, by Fray Francisco Céliz. Translated by Fritz Leo Hoffmann. [Quivira Society Publications, Volume V.] (Los Angeles, the Society, 1935, pp. 124, $5.50.) This document, written by the chaplain of the Alarcón expedition, was discovered in 1933 and printed before the end of the year in *La Universidad de México.* It presents in English additional information on the resurgence of the international competition which planted Spain firmly in Texas. Alarcón and his soldiers were the characteristic Spanish answer to the French menace personified in Louis Juchereau de St. Denis. In their explorations between the Rio Grande and the Red River these men founded the Villa de Bejar, the genesis of San Antonio, and likewise established the mission San Antonio de Valero, thus giving concrete demonstration of the utility of missionization in maintaining or pushing forward the international frontier. The significance of the Alarcón expedition and documentation like Céliz's, naturally, rest largely upon the subsequent importance of Texas.

The diaries of western exploration, except in the case of specialists in the East, have always been chiefly interesting in the West. This diary given us in English by Mr. Hoffmann will be more useful to laymen in the regions concerned and more illuminating to scholars everywhere because of the high editorial standards of the Quivira Society. Yet it is not so carefully edited as Volume IV. The type and paper are all that could be desired, while the frequent plates provide pleasant atmosphere unexpected in so formal a document. Mr. Hoffmann has apparently discovered that in editing a Spanish colonial document many decisions on minutiae and technicalities have to be made arbitrarily.

Duke University. JOHN TATE LANNING.

Les Quakers en Amérique au dix-septième siècle et au début du dix-huitième. Par Pierre Brodin, agrégé de l'Université, docteur ès lettres. (Saint-Amand, Ch. A. Bédu, 1935, pp. 394.) In this work each topic is preceded by an extended list of sources and bibliography, which reveals a painstaking and successful research. Its documentation is an admirable feature of the book. It cannot be claimed that the story here told advances many new facts, or strikingly new and original interpretations; nor is it based upon exhaustive details, especially in its treatment of the European background and origins of Quaker colonization in America. For example, it devotes only one

page to the settlement of Germantown and its European precursors, a narrative which has demanded 450 pages at the hands of the present reviewer. But in view of the very wide scope of the treatise, historical perspective and proportion have been well preserved, and the narrative is written in a fluent and pleasing style. Coming as it does from a scholar of *la belle France,* and devoted to the story of a small and relatively obscure religious sect in America, it is a wholesome illustration of the essential unity of all history and the importance of even the flower in the crannied nook, a thorough knowledge of which may aid in the understanding of both man and God. As for the light the book throws upon American history, the author's painstaking narrative of many of its details justifies his claim that Quakerism's adjustment to such profoundly diverse elements as those met with in "the theocratic communities of New England and in the tobacco plantations of the South . . . illustrates in noteworthy fashion the multiplicity of local differences on this continent in the 17th century"; and he shows that the "Holy Experiment" of Quaker colonization and government in Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey "is without doubt the event of capital importance in this period of American history".

Swarthmore College. WILLIAM I. HULL.

Evolution of Executive Departments of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789. By Jennings B. Sanders, Ph. D., Associate Professor of History, University of Alabama. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1935, pp. ix, 213, $2.00.) There is a general impression, manifesting itself at times even in quarters historical, that the executive departments of the Federal government have their springs only in the Constitution and the organic acts of the first Congress. It is the chief function of Professor Sanders's book to show that, on the contrary, these departments had their crude beginnings in the early days of the old Congress, that under that Congress they gradually took on form and substance like unto those with which they are now endowed, and that they were received by the new government as implements already shaped to its hand; in short, that there was a well-defined continuity of development through the entire life of the old government down into the beginnings of the new. There is of course little resemblance between the gathering of a temporary committee of the Continental Congress in 1775 and the executive departments as constituted today; yet every one of the older departments—state (or foreign affairs), war, navy, treasury—had its origin in just such a committee.

Part I of the work traces this development through its successive stages—casual committees, standing committees, mixed boards, boards of nonmembers up to the time, in 1781, when multiple gave place to single administrative heads. Part II follows the three principal departments—war, foreign affairs, and treasury—from their respective organizations under single re-

sponsible heads until at length they were passed on to the new government. The fact to be remembered is that they did pass over to the new government as functioning organs in tolerable vigor, despite the bodily infirmities of the government of which they had been parts. To this unbroken line of development there are two partial exceptions: the treasury, which in 1784 was made to revert to the board form, and the navy, which was for a time glued to the department of finance, as it was then called.

To complete the record of departmental evolution from out the old government into the new Professor Sanders adds a chapter on the post office and another on the office of secretary of Congress. Older than the Congress itself, the post office was taken over by the Revolutionary government rather as an ally than as a governmental department, yet in its latter days Congress was at much pains to organize and develop the system, with such a degree of success that it was some time before the succeeding government found need for reform. The office of secretary of Congress appears to have narrowly missed finding a place under the new system; but it did miss, consequently there is now no counterpart or successor of that office which was probably the most vital organ of the old Congress.

Carnegie Institution of Washington. EDMUND C. BURNETT.

A History of the College of Charleston, Founded 1770. By J. H. Easterby. (Charleston, College of Charleston, 1935, pp. 379, $3.50.) For the alumni of the College of Charleston and for others who are, or have been, connected with that institution, this volume holds a very personal interest. For those who have a general interest in the culture of the Old South, it has a less personal but a broader appeal. As a center of the nullification and secession controversies, and as a city where, according to many travelers, Southern society was to be seen at its best, Charleston has received much controversial attention from the historian. It is therefore pleasant to turn aside in these pages from political and social controversy and trace the development of the College of Charleston as a concrete example of the intellectual life of this Carolina community.

With the organization of the Charleston Library Society in 1748, the agitation for a local academy began. In 1770 the colonial assembly was prevented from chartering a Charleston college by the political struggle which soon ripened into revolution. The coming of war interrupted further efforts and a charter was not granted until 1785, at which time lands were set aside in the city which had been designated by the bill of 1770 and on which barracks had been constructed during the war. Certain private bequests were made, but the trustees were not able to open a school until the Reverend Robert Smith transferred his private school to the renovated barracks in 1790. From that time until 1837 there was an intermittent struggle to con-

vert the academy into a college, in which year a new charter was granted and the city definitely assumed responsibility for the institution, thus making it the first municipal college in the country.

Practicing democracy and religious freedom and maintaining a standard of classical education quite in advance of anything which can be generally maintained at the present time, the little college struggled on against many odds. Lack of funds was hardly so serious an obstacle as lack of students, for Charleston was a small community with a limited back country to draw from, and few students could meet the entrance requirements. Yet during the fifties, a group of really distinguished scientists, including Agassiz, Maury, Tuomey, Holmes, Bachman, and McCrady, were associated in one way or another with the work of the college. The institution functioned throughout the Confederate War and came out with its property intact and its endowment actually increased. During the years that followed, its fortunes reached their lowest ebb, due mainly to lack of students. In 1883 the college had an enrollment of ten and in 1897 income from tuition and fees amounted to $110 for the year. From that point it has since made steady growth.

Mr. Easterby, a member of the faculty, tells the story with obvious personal interest but with scholarly accuracy, and throws many valuable sidelights on the life that was and is Charleston.

The University of Virginia. THOMAS PERKINS ABERNETHY.

The Netherlands and the United States: their Relations in the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century. By J. C. Westermann. [Economisch- en Sociaal- Historische Onderzoekingen onder redactie van Prof. Mr. N. W. Posthumus.] (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1935, pp. xix, 415, $5.50.) The field of Dutch-American relations, already assiduously cultivated by Dutch and by American scholars, receives an important addition in this study, which exhausts the subject of the re-establishment of reciprocity in the commerce between the United States and the European territory of the Netherlands, in the years following the liberation of the Netherlands from the Napoleonic conquest. What with the earlier studies of Colenbrander, Van Wijk, and Van Winter, and the work of the Dutch-American Hoekstra, the Americans Jameson and Kohlmeier, and the German Edler, little or nothing can now be added to the history of cultural, economic, and political relations between the two countries in the first half century of American independence. This volume is a doctoral thesis for the University of Amsterdam, written in English by a Dutch scholar who has exploited the sources, printed and unprinted, in the Netherlands, England, and the United States. While the work suffers in style from its English composition and from frequent typographical errors, it may be regarded as a definitive examination of

a small but not unimportant field and subject, and a companion volume to F. L. Benns's one-archive study of the United States and the carrying trade of the British West Indies.

The author does not pay sufficient attention to the Dutch law of 1822 which soon appeared to evade the reciprocity so laboriously constructed by the negotiations and legislation of 1814-1818. His study should have been extended to include this. There is, however, a most useful, and unique, summary of the history of the treaty of 1782 between the Netherlands and the United States.

Yale University. SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS.

Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States: Inter-American Affairs, 1831–1860. Selected and arranged by William R. Manning, Division of Latin American Affairs, Department of State. Volume V, *Chile and Colombia.* Documents 1579-2190 d. (Washington, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1935, pp. xl, 1015, $5.00.) With the exception of a few brief intervals, the United States maintained a diplomat in Chile continuously through the three decades covered by this publication, but the Chilean government had a diplomatic mission in the United States only about one third of the time; and although the Washington government kept a legation open in Colombia during all but two years of the period, the Colombian legation in the United States was closed more than half of the time. This diversity in policy was probably caused by two factors: the finances of Chile and Colombia were not on a sound footing and the interest of Colombian and Chilean statesmen in relations with the United States was not as great as that of the statesmen on the Potomac in these two Hispanic-American countries.

In spite of the editor's general policy of excluding correspondence regarding pecuniary claims, several claims are included in this volume because of their important international aspects. The right of asylum also bulks large in the correspondence relating to Chile, while the Isthmus of Panama is important in the documents which deal with the relations of the United States and Colombia or New Granada. Perhaps of more significance than any of these matters, however, is the question of the regulation of commercial intercourse; and the volume throws considerable light on the relations of Chile and Colombia with England and France.

In technical matters the editor has not fallen below the high standard set in previous volumes. All scholars interested in this field are under a heavy obligation to Dr. Manning and the Carnegie Endowment.

Duke University. J. FRED RIPPY.

Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South. By William Sumner Jenkins, Assistant Professor of Political Science in the University of North Carolina.

(Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1935, pp. xi, 381, $2.50.) The first chapter of this monograph consists of a brief historical treatment of the colonial origins of antislavery and proslavery thought. The former arose out of the pious faith of the Quakers and the natural rights philosophy of the Revolutionary period. It gained momentum as slavery came to be viewed as inconsistent with the principles advanced in defense of the Revolution itself. The latter first developed out of opposition to religious activities among the slaves, through fear that such efforts at amelioration would lead to emancipation. Baptism, it was thought, would tend to alter the status of the slave. The need for defense of the institution revived, from time to time, the entire catalogue of ancient arguments: that "slavery was a natural phenomenon of society", that the "social condition of the slaves compared favorably with the peasant classes in other parts of the world", that slave labor was essential to the development of tropical countries, etc.

The second chapter traces the audible defense of slavery in the early sessions of the Congress, the development in the South of a conservative reaction to "the radical principles of the Revolutionary era", and the development of the positive good argument.

Professor Jenkins then analyzes the complex proslavery argument—the statement of the defense—which was completed in its principal philosophic and legalistic aspects by 1835. He discusses at length the several theories of the origin of slavery and its legal basis, the relation of the institution to the state, its status under the Constitution, its moral and religious moorings, and the theory of racial and biological inequality. One does not have to read very far to realize how hopelessly divided proslavery thought was, even with respect to the most fundamental aspects of the institution. Since the nature and extent of its defense were determined by the nature of the indictments hurled against it and the seriousness of those indictments from the standpoint of the security of the institution, one may well question the utility of attempting to discuss the theory of that defense apart from the general history of the period. Is it possible to understand the defense of slavery any more than it is possible to understand slavery itself apart from its social and economic background?

The book is heavily documented and has an extensive bibliography. It is well written, but overburdened in places with quotations from sources which are readily accessible to the reader.

The University of Michigan. DWIGHT L. DUMOND.

They built the West: an Epic of Rails and Cities. By Glenn Chesney Quiett. (New York, D. Appleton-Century Company, 1934, pp. xx, 569, $5.00.) Twenty-six chapters depict the rise of Western cities since the Civil War—from Denver to Spokane and Seattle. The rivalries for railway lines and the construction of the great Western trunk lines furnish the master-

key in the process. On this stage loom such builders as Grenville M. Dodge, Thomas C. Durant, James J. Hill, C. P. Huntington, William J. Palmer, and Henry Villard.

Los Angeles is California's "First Real Estate Promotion", San Diego was "left off the main line", Portland was the city that "gravity built", and Tacoma was a railroad creation. Less is said about the rigid facts of geography in deflecting or determining routes and influencing the location of towns and cities—now grown great or long ago vanished.

The rugged individualist's day is over, the author states. Many ruthless exploiters whose "ethics were in tune with the ethics of the day" became big givers to colleges and libraries. The author believes "it would be a pity to lose from American life the shrewd planning, the daring execution, the dogged determination of these exploiters and buccaneers".

Three maps, the bibliographies, and an index are assets to the volume. A gallery of 128 pictures illustrates the text. The stories, while not even in their values, are written with vividness and reflect much of the spirit of the age they describe. The contribution of the work is not in new materials but in the assembly and new integration of data on the processes and personages that "built the West".

L. P.

John 'Lind of Minnesota. By George M. Stephenson. (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1935, pp. 398, $4.00.) John Lind was brought to Minnesota by his immigrant parents at the age of fourteen. As a rural teacher and country lawyer he developed a deep-seated suspicion of land, transportation, and milling companies. After three terms in Congress as a Republican he drifted with many of his constituents into the Populist ranks and when they disbanded found himself in the Democratic party. Elected governor in 1898, he struggled to secure reform legislation in a state which was enjoying agricultural prosperity. Upon failing to be re-elected in 1900 he returned to the practice of law.

Lind's record entitled him to consideration by the new Democratic administration of 1913 but he was as surprised as anyone when invited to go to Mexico as Woodrow Wilson's personal representative. In the confused affairs of the Mexican Republic the President saw only the issue of liberalism versus conservatism and, in his judgment, the crusading spirit of the Minnesota Swede overbalanced the knowledge and training that another choice might have offered. Lind did not disappoint his chief and his biographer has skillfully woven together extracts from correspondence and dispatches that tell the story of Huerta and Carranza. Now, for the first time, the history of the Lind mission which was the target of so many partisan and religious attacks is satisfactorily told.

Although Professor Stephenson has written the "family biography" he has not neglected to describe the anti-railroad congressman who solicited

passes and the diplomat who was accused of plagiarizing the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. He disproves what many contemporaries assumed, that Lind was elected by his Swedish compatriots; but his leaning to the theory that the Swedes were Republicans because they were "voting cattle" does not do justice to thousands of serious citizens who had as much reason for holding as tenaciously to their doctrines as Lind did to his. Many critics in 1913–1914 considered Lind an agent of Protestant bigotry attacking Mexican institutions and therefore the attention given to the attitude of the clergymen who throughout his early career had opposed him as an infidel is enlightening. Professor Stephenson has presented him as he was: at home and abroad, a Populist.

The University of Illinois. MARCUS L. HANSEN.

Foreign Interest in the Independence of New Spain: an Introduction to the War for Independence. By John Rydjord, Professor of History, Municipal University of Wichita. [Duke University Publications.] (Durham, Duke University Press, 1935, pp. xii, 347, $3.00.) The author essays, as he states in the preface, "to show the scope of the foreign influence and bring all the isolated incidents into a related whole". The plans of Martín Cortés, La Salle, Nolan, Miranda, Burr, Iturrigaray, Genêt, Popham, and others are discussed. This results in the title being not broad enough for the book or else some materials included might well have been omitted as not closely related to the subject. Some sections have little to do with New Spain and the chapter on the Mexican reaction to Napoleon, for instance, has little connection with foreign interest. The reviewer regrets that the tracing of foreign interest is concluded with the "Grito de Dolores", for to have had the story complete to the date of independence in one volume would have made a helpful book of more value to the student of colonial Hispanic America.

Foreign interest in the independence of New Spain was primarily economic, based upon a desire to participate in her trade. Occasional spasms of greed for the gold and silver mines themselves were experienced by Spain's enemies; and citizens of the Western states of the American Union were the chief offenders in this aspect of foreign interest. Their desire for land was increased by their distrust of the Spaniard as a neighbor. Coupled with this Western greed was the more altruistic but less general wish to extend the benefits of American freedom below the border. French and British interest in Mexico was stimulated by their distrust of each other; each feared that the other might seize the prize. Nevertheless an independent Mexico was the common ideal of the rival powers throughout most of the period.

Professor Rydjord has gathered his materials in the archives of all of the countries concerned. A large quantity of secondary material has been consulted as well. There is an extensive bibliography and a carefully prepared index.

Westminster College. JOHN C. PATTERSON.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY FOR 1935

THE Executive Council of the Association held, as is customary, two meetings during the year, the first on December 1 at the Harvard Club of New York City, the second on December 27 at Chattanooga. There were thirteen members of the Council present at the first meeting; nine at the second. The Executive Committee of the Council met twice during the year, once in March and once in November, both times at the office of the Executive Secretary in Philadelphia. Attendance (not including the Executive Secretary) at the first meeting, five; at the second meeting, four. All the activities of the Association hereafter to be noted are in general charge of the Executive Secretary, under the immediate direction of the Executive Committee and subject to the general control of the Executive Council.

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW. The *Review* during the year has been edited by Dr. Bourne with the assistance of the Board of Editors. There has been no marked change in editorial policy. The practice followed heretofore of discontinuing payments for contributions to the *Review* and for book reviews has been followed with apparently no diminution in the willingness of scholars to submit contributions and to co-operate in book reviewing. The management of the *Review*, mindful of the necessity of keeping down costs to a minimum, has tried to hold the size of the magazine as nearly as practicable to the minimum of two hundred pages fixed by contract with the printers and has succeeded remarkably well. It must be realized, however, that more space is needed if writers of articles are not to be unduly restricted and if reviews of important books are not to be unduly curtailed. Here as in so many departments of the Association's activities the need for larger resources is pressing.

Financially, thanks largely to careful management, the *Review* has yielded a larger return this year than last year and nearly $700 more than was anticipated by the Finance Committee in its budget for the year. The printers advise that we cannot expect so good a showing next year.

The *Review* is ordinarily dependent upon articles submitted. In a few cases articles are solicited and there is pressure from some quarters to develop this practice further. It should be remembered, however, that if this were done the function of the *Review* as a general medium for the publication of the results of individual scholarly research would be impaired. As it is many scholarly articles have had to be rejected because of lack of space.

Some complaint has been made that the *Review* prints more articles in the

field of American than of European history. An examination of recent volumes of the *Review* will disclose the fact that this complaint is not justified. It ought to be borne in mind, moreover, that a national medium for scholarly articles in the medieval European field is offered by *Speculum*, and in the modern European field by *The Journal of Modern History*.

The term of office of the present Managing Editor expires on June 30, 1936. The Executive Committee appointed a special committee, consisting of Carlton J. H. Hayes, Guy Stanton Ford, Waldo G. Leland, Dexter Perkins, and Conyers Read, to consider the whole question of the management of the *Review* and to make recommendations. That committee had not finished its work when this report was originally presented to the Council. The committee found it necessary to seek a new Managing Editor outside of Washington with the consequence that the office of the *Review* will have to be separated from the Washington office of the Association (see page 603).

Commission on the Social Studies. It will be recalled that the term of the Commission on the Social Studies, appointed for five years, expired on December 29, 1933. Its work was not yet finished and the business of finishing it was turned over by the Council (minutes of December 28, 1933) to the Executive Committee. At that time the cash balance standing to the credit of the Commission amounted to $38,993.21. The Council directed that this balance should be applied to the expense of winding up the affairs of the Commission and that any residue should, with the consent of the Carnegie Corporation, be applied to the uses of *The Historical Outlook*. The consent of the Carnegie Corporation to the application of this residue was secured.

All this is set forth at length in the report of the Executive Secretary for 1934 (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, April, 1935), together with the progress made that year in reorganizing the magazine *The Historical Outlook* under its new name *The Social Studies*, and in publishing the manuscripts accepted for publication by the Commission on the Social Studies before its dissolution.

During the year 1935 the following volumes were published: *The Social Foundations of Education*, by George S. Counts; *The Social Sciences as School Subjects*, by Rolla M. Tryon; and *The Social Ideas of American Educators*, by Merle Curti; leaving four manuscripts accepted for publication and not yet ready for the press. These manuscripts are as follows: *Can American Teachers be Free*, by Howard K. Beale; *A Social Process Approach to Curriculum-Making in the Social Studies*, by Leon C. Marshall; *The Teacher of the Social Studies*, by William C. Bagley; and *Methods of Instruction in the Social Studies*, by Ernest Horn. Of these, the manuscripts of Messrs. Beale, Marshall, and Bagley are in the hands of the Executive Secretary. Horn's manuscript is promised for April, 1936. There seems to be no reason why the Marshall and Bagley manuscripts should not be printed in regular course. Beale's manuscript will go to press almost at once.

The Finance Committee, at the request of the Executive Secretary, has undertaken to set up a budget of expenditures hereafter to be incurred out of the balance standing to the credit of the Commission on the Social Studies. The details of this budget for the current year form part of the report of the Finance Committee, which is on file in the office of the Executive Secretary.

It is estimated that the expense of winding up the affairs of the Commission will not exceed $2000, leaving a balance unexpended about sufficient to finance the magazine *The Social Studies* until the end of the fiscal year 1937.

The Social Studies. The magazine *The Social Studies* has continued during the year under the management of Mr. W. G. Kimmel with a Board of Editors appointed by the Council of the A.H.A., Mr. Charles A. Beard being Chairman of the Board and the Executive Secretary, Secretary *ex officio*. The annual budget set up for the management of the magazine amounts to $10,000. By action of the Council this budget has been put under the general charge of the Finance Committee and made subject to the approval of the Council.

The Social Studies is the official organ of the National Council for the Social Studies and is distributed to all paying members of that organization. It, therefore, serves as a valuable connecting link between the Association and the National Council. It will be noted, however, that the Association appoints the Board of Editors and controls the finances.

Since the A.H.A. took over *The Social Studies* the circulation has increased about 15 per cent, but the magazine yields no revenue, and, as already pointed out, funds earmarked for its support will be exhausted in two years' time. The Association is, therefore, faced in the near future with the problem of either withdrawing support from the enterprise or finding money to maintain it. There can be no doubt at all that *The Social Studies* is serving a very useful purpose, particularly to the secondary school teachers in the field of the social studies. It is very definitely addressed to quite a different clientele from that of *The American Historical Review*.

Commission on History: College Entrance Examination Board. The work of this Commission, its personnel, and its objectives were set forth in the report of the Executive Secretary for 1934. Its work is approaching conclusion. It has already presented a preliminary report to the College Entrance Examination Board, in which it has defined in general terms what it regards as a desirable plan for the teaching of social studies in the secondary schools and how such a plan should be examined for in the college entrance examination. It has at present subcommittees at work on details. No part of its findings can yet be made public, but it expects to publish these findings when they are ready. The Commission is not definitely under the direction of the A.H.A. and is not financed by the A.H.A., but its chairman is Executive Secretary of the A.H.A., most of its members are prominent members of the

A.H.A., and the work it is doing aligns it very closely with earlier work of committees of the A.H.A., dealing with analogous problems, notably with that of the famous Committee of Seven.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE A.H.A. The Council of the A.H.A. at its meeting December 2, 1934, discussed the whole question of the publication policy of the A.H.A. and of the relations of the A.H.A. to the problems associated with the discovery, preservation, and publication of documents in public archives and in private collections. At that time the Council appointed a committee of two to consider the relationship of the A.H.A. to the whole problem of documentary publications and of public and private archives and to make specific recommendations to the Council. This committee was also charged with the duty of considering, formulating, and presenting plans for a nationwide survey of archival materials.

The committee has since presented its report, in which it has recommended that the Committee on the Documentary Historical Publications of the United States, heretofore one of the standing committees of the A.H.A., be discontinued, since the work of that committee will doubtless be assumed by the National Historical Publications Commission, and that two committees be set up (in place of the three committees, Historical Manuscripts Commission, Public Archives Commission, and Publications Committee, heretofore in charge of these matters) as follows:

I. Committee on Historical Source Materials of seven members, with two subcommittees organized within it, as follows: (a) Subcommittee on Public Archives, three members; (b) Subcommittee on Historical Manuscripts, three members.

II. Committee on Publications of thirteen members, with four subcommittees organized within it, as follows: (a) Subcommittee on *Annual Report,* three members; (b) Subcommittee on the Littleton-Griswold Fund, three members; (c) Subcommittee on the Albert J. Beveridge Fund, three members; (d) Subcommittee on the Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications, three members.

The Council endorsed the recommendation for dismissing the Committee on the Documentary Historical Publications of the United States and for establishing the Committee on Historical Source Materials, but it has reserved for further consideration the recommendation for a Committee on Publications as designed by this special committee.

ANNUAL REPORT. The *Annual Report* of the Association has not been published for the years 1933-1935 because of lack of government appropriations for the purpose. There is fair promise that an appropriation will be made by the government this year in sufficient amount to admit of the publication of the *Annual Report.* The question was raised at the meeting of the Council on December 2, 1934, as to when the Association should resume the publication of the *Annual Report* and as to whether that report should

follow the traditional pattern. The question was referred to a committee of three. This committee reported to the Council at its meeting on December 1, 1935, recommending that the publication of the *Annual Report* be resumed as soon as money was available for the purpose, but that steps be taken to abbreviate it. The Council took action upon this report as follows:

Voted, That the essential portions of *Proceedings* of the American Historical Association should be printed, and that the report of the Committee on Publication of *Proceedings* should be referred to the Editor of the Association with the general approval of the Council.

Voted, That all Council minutes and all votes passed by the Executive Committee subsequent to the minutes printed in the *Annual Report* for 1932 be hereafter printed in the *Annual Report.*

Committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund. During the year this Committee has published *The Letters of Theodore Dwight Weld, Angelina Grimké Weld, and Sarah Grimké,* edited by Gilbert H. Barnes and Dwight L. Dumond, and *Instructions to the British Colonial Governors,* in two volumes, edited by Leonard W. Labaree. It has in press *The Texan Revolutionary Correspondence,* edited by W. C. Binkley, *Extracts from the Reports of the Procureurs-Général, 1860-1867, regarding the American Civil War and the French Expedition in Mexico,* edited by Lynn M. Case, and *Extracts from the Cumberland Papers in Windsor Castle dealing with the French and Indian War,* prepared under the direction of S. M. Pargellis. Three other projects, an edition of the John Jay correspondence by Mr. Frank Monaghan, a collection of Northern editorials on secession and war, 1861, by Mr. H. C. Perkins, and the papers of R. F. W. Allston, a rice planter and politician of South Carolina, by Mr. J. H. Easterby, are approaching completion. The Committee has funds in hand to finance this entire program. It is making plans for further volumes to follow.

Committee on the Littleton-Griswold Fund. During the year this Committee has published a second volume of its American Legal Records—*Select Cases of the Mayor's Court of New York City, 1674-1784,* edited by Richard B. Morris. The Committee proposes to publish its third volume, *Records of the Vice-Admiralty Court of Rhode Island,* edited by Dorothy S. Towle, with an Introduction by Charles M. Andrews, as soon as there is a sufficient balance standing to the credit of the Committee to pay for the printing. The manuscript is now ready for the printer. Following this, the Committee contemplates a volume on North Carolina county court records, to be edited by Mr. A. C. McIntosh of the University of North Carolina.

It will be recalled that the American Legal Records are being published directly by the American Historical Association through the office of the Executive Secretary. Sales for the first two volumes of the series up to October 16, 1935, aggregated: for the first volume, 179 copies; for the second volume, 136 copies. Gross receipts from sales during the fiscal year amounted

to $1095.85. At the end of the fiscal year there was a balance of $396.81 standing to the credit of the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON THE CARNEGIE REVOLVING FUND. This Committee has published during the year Samuel Flagg Bemis's *Foundations of American Diplomacy: the American Revolution,* and M. B. Garrett's *The Estates-General of 1789.* In the hands of the publishers is one other volume: *The Older Middle West,* by H. C. Hubbart. It is expected that this manuscript will be published early in 1936.

The American Council of Learned Societies out of its revolving fund has contributed $1000 toward the expense of printing Mr. Bemis's volume, and $700 toward the expense of publishing Mr. Hubbart's volume. Royalties for the fiscal year 1934-1935 from volumes already published aggregated $1388.50. It appears likely that when all commitments connected with the volumes now in press are discharged the Committee will have available a cash balance sufficient to finance three more publications. It has now under consideration four manuscripts, one of which will in all probability be accepted, one is being revised, and two are at present in doubt. The Committee has already published fourteen volumes and has two more in press.

This Committee has done notable work. It will probably be able to show at least twenty volumes published out of an original contribution by the Carnegie Corporation of $25,000. There seems to be no immediate promise of a renewal of this grant, and it can hardly be expected that income from royalties will enable the Committee to maintain its present rate of publication. There seems to be no dearth of good material available for its consideration. When it is recalled that it is the only publication fund held by the Association for publications in the whole field of history the desirability of securing further support for it becomes very apparent.

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES. No meeting of this Committee was held in the current year. The A.H.A. still keeps in active connection with its work. A detailed report of its activities will be published later. The Subcommission on Colonial History has published during the year Alfred Martineau and Louis Philippe May's *Tableau de l'expansion européenne à travers le monde de la fin du XII^e^ au début du XIX^e^ siècle,* and has in press Lowell Joseph Ragatz's *Bibliography of Articles, Descriptive, Historical, and Scientific, on Colonies and Other Dependent Territories appearing in American Geographical and Kindred Journals,* which will appear this spring. The annual compilation of a bibliography covering writings on Colonial history is being continued. These bibliographies, prepared by countries, are in certain cases being published for working purposes. Lowell Joseph Ragatz's *A List of Books and Articles on Colonial History and Overseas Expansion published in the United States in 1933, 1934, and 1935* will appear in the course of the year. All of these national bibliographies are to be consolidated in *Bibliographie d'histoire coloniale, 1931-1935,* which

will be brought out in 1936 or 1937 under a subsidy from the French government.

The Association pays $85 annually for membership in this International Committee and contributes $200 annually to the preparation of the *International Bibliography*.

Committee on Americana for College Libraries. This Committee, whose work is made possible by the benevolence of a good friend of the Association who prefers to remain anonymous, continues to build up significant collections of rare books on American history in selected college libraries. Nine colleges are now participating in the plan: two in New England, two in the Middle States, and five in the South. It is the aim of this Committee to establish its collections in regions remote from important cultural centers. In the period from February 19, 1934, to July 31, 1935, participating colleges have appropriated a total of $4750 to the promotion of the plan, and the donor has contributed $9000. Of this total, $12,279.19 has been expended on 550 rare books, of which 200 have already been taken by the participating colleges for a total sum of $6661.92. This leaves a stock on hand awaiting distribution of $5617.27.

The plan is working admirably. It is desirable that it should be extended to the Middle West and the Far West. The Committee has been indefatigable in its efforts to establish connections in these regions but so far without success, the chief difficulty being that colleges in these regions have not been able to find the funds to enable them to pay their share in an enterprise which calls for equal contributions from the participating units and from the donor.

Pan American Institute. The A.H.A. has been invited to nominate members for the National Committee of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, provided for at the Sixth International Conference of American States, held in Havana in 1928. The object of this institute, which is endorsed by the United States Department of State, is to "serve for the co-ordination, distribution, and publication of geographical and historical studies in the American States". Names of ten distinguished American scholars in the Pan American field have been submitted to the United States Department of State by the Council of the Association for appointment to the National Committee, but appointments have not yet been announced.

Radio Committee. The Radio Committee of the A.H.A. has prepared a plan for the broadcasting of history which was printed in *Radio and Education* and offprints of which were distributed at the Annual Meeting of the Association in 1934. A brief résumé of the plan, prepared by the Executive Secretary, was published in *The Social Studies* for May, 1935, and the plan was presented by the Executive Secretary at the annual assembly of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education at Columbus, Ohio, May 7, 1935. The plan has been formally approved by the Council of the A.H.A.

and by the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education. During the current year the Radio Committee has made persistent efforts to secure funds for the realization of its program. So far it has not yet been successful, but it means to persist until its aims are realized.

Committee on Union Catalogue of Philadelphia Libraries. The Executive Secretary in his annual report for 1934 outlined this project. The committee in charge is not a committee of the A.H.A., but the project has been fostered by the A.H.A. since its inception and the Executive Secretary has taken an active part in it. During the current year, under the general direction of Mr. Paul Vanderbilt of the Pennsylvania Museum of Art, and with the generous co-operation of the Library of Congress, extensive experiments have been conducted in the development of a technique for preparing a union catalogue. Mr. Vanderbilt's report on these experiments constitutes a very important contribution to library technique and has been widely distributed in mimeographed form. The Committee has also developed an elaborate plan for utilizing WPA workers in the making of this union catalogue and has submitted the plan to the WPA. The plan has been accepted. It calls for the contribution by the WPA of over $100,000 and for a contribution by the Union Catalogue Committee of about $16,000. The plan provides for the management of the project by directors and assistant directors appointed and paid by the Committee. The contribution called for by the plan from the Committee has been underwritten in part by the American Philosophical Society, in part by other contributors. Mr. Vanderbilt, who has already had wide experience in utilizing government workers in library projects, has agreed to assume the directorship of the project, and thanks are due to the Pennsylvania Museum of Art for its generosity in relieving Mr. Vanderbilt of some part of his usual duties to enable him to serve. Thanks are due also to the Philadelphia Commercial Museum and to the Pennsylvania Historical Society for providing housing accommodations for the project while it is in progress. But most of all, thanks are due to the small and devoted band of scholars, librarians, and citizens, under the chairmanship of Mr. C. W. David of Bryn Mawr College, whose undaunted spirit and whose unflagging energy in the face of every sort of discouragement have brought this very important contribution to the work of scholars in every field of learning so near to realization.

Finances. The report of the Treasurer has been distributed to all members of the Association. It reveals a balance at the end of the fiscal year 1934-1935 substantially larger than the budget committee of the Council had foreseen. This increase is to be accounted for in part by the generosity of the Carnegie Corporation in contributing $3500 to the expense of the office of the Executive Secretary, in part to a gratifying increase in receipts from annual dues, and in part to an increase in profits from *The American Historical Review*. In consequence the Association is able to start the fiscal

year 1935 with a credit balance of a little over $10,000. Notwithstanding this balance, it is apparent that the estimated current expenses of the Association on the basis of its present program of operations will exceed its estimated current revenues, that it will probably reach the end of the fiscal year 1935-1936 with a balance of less than $5000, and that unless new sources of revenue are disclosed, or the present sources increase in volume, it will face a deficit of something like $1000 at the end of the fiscal year 1936-1937. The situation, therefore, although bright enough for the present, cannot be regarded as satisfactory. The Association has no leeway to enlarge its activities, every one of which is seriously hampered by lack of funds, and no resources at all to extend its activities.

The Finance Committee "feels that an exceptional effort ought to be made to enlarge the membership of the Association, so that the net gain, annually, never falls below one hundred members. A growth as modest as that will suffice to satisfy the financial requirements of the Association. If it is to expand its work, however, still greater growth will be imperative. When the situation in the nation as a whole indicates that efforts to secure additional funds for the endowment might be rewarded with some success", the Finance Committee "will endeavor to take advantage of every opportunity to do so."

Board of Trustees. The investments of the Association are in the hands of the Board of Trustees acting through the agency of the Fiduciary Trust Company of New York. The securities of the Association when they were turned over to the Board of Trustees showed a market value of $173,753. At the close of the fiscal year 1933-1934 these securities showed a market value of $197,802; at the close of the fiscal year 1934-1935, $217,656.67. In a word, without any additional contribution to the endowment fund the value of the endowment of the Association has increased by $43,903.67, or 29 per cent.

This increase in principal value has not been accompanied by a corresponding increase in revenue. Annual income from investments for all purposes amounted, in the fiscal year 1934-1935, to $9234.55, of which a little less than half ($4484.35) is available for the general purposes of the Association, the balance being applied to special funds for special purposes. The fees charged by the Fiduciary Trust Company for detailed management of investments amounted in the fiscal year 1934-1935 to $800.51.

The Association has good reason to congratulate itself upon the results of the management of its investments, and owes a deep debt of gratitude to the members of its Board of Trustees, three of whom are very prominent and very active figures in the banking world, for placing their own services and the facilities of their own institutions at the disposal of the American Historical Association.

Conyers Read, *Executive Secretary.*

As the report of the Treasurer of the Association, Dr. Constantine E.

McGuire, is already in the hands of the members of the Association it is deemed unnecessary to mention the principal items in this place.

The Officers and Committees of the Association for 1936 are:

President, Charles H. McIlwain, Harvard University.

First Vice-President, Guy Stanton Ford, University of Minnesota.

Second Vice-President, Laurence M. Larson, University of Illinois.

Secretary, Dexter Perkins, University of Rochester.

Executive Secretary, Conyers Read, 226 South 16th St., Philadelphia.

Treasurer, Constantine E. McGuire, 40 Independence Ave., S. W., Washington, D. C.

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, Patty W. Washington, 40 Independence Ave., S. W., Washington, D. C.

Editor of the Annual Report, Lowell Joseph Ragatz, George Washington University.

Council: (*ex officio*) the president, vice-presidents, secretary, and treasurer; (elected members) John D. Hicks, Julian P. Bretz, R. D. W. Connor, Wallace Notestein, Dumas Malone, William L. Westermann, Bessie L. Pierce, Frederick Merk; (former presidents) J. Franklin Jameson, Albert Bushnell Hart, Andrew C. McLaughlin, George L. Burr, Worthington C. Ford, Charles H. Haskins, Edward P. Cheyney, Charles M. Andrews, Henry Osborn Taylor, Evarts B. Greene, Carl Becker, Herbert E. Bolton, Charles A. Beard, William E. Dodd, Michael I. Rostovtzeff.

Executive Committee of the Council: Dixon Ryan Fox, Union College, chairman; Julian P. Bretz, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Dumas Malone; (*ex officio*) Dexter Perkins, Constantine E. McGuire.

Board of Trustees: Conyers Read, 226 South 16th St., Philadelphia, chairman; Raymond N. Ball, Guy Emerson, Tracy W. McGregor, Thomas I. Parkinson.

Officers of the Pacific Coast Branch: President, Percy A. Martin, Stanford University; *Vice-President,* Joseph B. Lockey, University of California at Los Angeles; *Secretary-Treasurer,* Francis H. Herrick, Mills College; *Executive Council* (the above) and G. H. Alden, Earl Cranston, E. M. Eriksson, Edith Dobie; *Editors of the Pacific Historical Review:* John C. Parish, University of California at Los Angeles, managing editor; R. C. Clark, Osgood Hardy, Yamato Ichihashi, Ralph S. Kuykendall, Frederic L. Paxson, Edward McMahon.

Committee on Program for the Fifty-first Annual Meeting: James B. Hedges, Brown University, chairman; others to be named.

Committee on Local Arrangements: Robert H. George, Brown University, secretary; others to be named.

Committee on Nominations: Avery O. Craven, University of Chicago, chairman; Viola Barnes, M. E. Curti, Paul Knaplund, J. Fred Rippy.

Board of Editors of the American Historical Review: Charles Seymour, Yale University, chairman; Henry E. Bourne, 40 Independence Ave.,

S. W., Washington, D. C., managing editor; J. Fred Rippy, Dumas Malone, Nellie Neilson, Arthur E. R. Boak, Preserved Smith.

Committee on Historical Source Material: T. R. Schellenberg, The National Archives, chairman; *Subcommittee on Public Archives,* Francis S. Philbrick, A. R. Newsome, Robert C. Binkley; *Subcommittee on Historical Manuscripts,* Julian P. Boyd, Lester J. Cappon, Theodore C. Blegen.

Committee on Membership: Raymond C. Miller, Wayne University, chairman; F. Lee Benns, Gray C. Boyce, Max Savelle, J. L. Sellers, Culver H. Smith.

Conference of Historical Societies: Christopher B. Coleman, Historical Bureau, Indianapolis, secretary.

Representatives of the Association in Allied Bodies: Social Science Research Council, Guy Stanton Ford, Roy F. Nichols, Arthur M. Schlesinger. *American Council of Learned Societies,* Evarts B. Greene, Edward P. Cheyney. *International Committee of Historical Sciences: Delegates,* Waldo G. Leland, William E. Dodd; *Subcommittee on Archives,* R. D. W. Connor; *Diplomatic History,* Samuel Flagg Bemis; *Chronology,* John L. La Monte; *Historical Iconography,* Leicester B. Holland; *Historical Geography,* Charles O. Paullin; *International Bibliography of Historical Sciences,* Waldo G. Leland.

Committees on Prizes: George Louis Beer Prize, Eugene N. Anderson, University of Chicago, chairman; Ross J. S. Hoffman, Dwight E. Lee; *John H. Dunning Prize,* Lester B. Shippee, University of Minnesota, chairman; Wendell H. Stephenson, Ella Lonn; *Jusserand Medal,* Carl Wittke, Ohio State University, chairman; Theodore C. Blegen, Eloise Ellery.

Committee on the Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications: Edward P. Cheyney, R. F. D. No. 3, Media, Pa., chairman; Vera Lee Brown, Kent R. Greenfield, William E. Lunt, Asa E. Martin.

Committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund: Roy F. Nichols, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Arthur C. Cole, James G. Randall.

Committee on the Littleton-Griswold Fund: Francis S. Philbrick, Law School, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Charles M. Andrews, Carroll T. Bond, Evarts B. Greene, Richard B. Morris, Thomas I. Parkinson, Charles Warren.

Committee on the Bibliography of American Travel: Frank Monaghan, Yale University, chairman; Julian P. Boyd, Harry M. Lydenberg.

Committee on Radio: Conyers Read, 226 South 16th St., Philadelphia, chairman; Evelyn Plummer Braun, John A. Krout, Ralph S. Rounds, William Slater, Elizabeth Y. Webb.

Committee on Americana for College Libraries: Randolph G. Adams, Clements Library, University of Michigan, chairman; William W. Bishop, J. Franklin Jameson, Tracy W. McGregor, Leonard L. Mackall, Conyers Read, Lawrence C. Wroth.

The Executive Committee of the Council has secured the services of Professor Robert Livingston Schuyler, of Columbia University, as Managing Editor of the *Review*. Dr. Schuyler is already familiar with the tasks of a managing editor, for he held that position with the *Political Science Quarterly* for the years 1919–1921. For the years 1923–1929 he was editor of the Columbia Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law. The breadth of his historical interests is also indicated by his own publications, among which are *The Constitution of the United States: an Historical Survey of its Formation* [lectures delivered at the University of Cambridge and the London School of Economics and Political Science]; *Parliament and the British Empire: Some Constitutional Controversies concerning Imperial Legislative Jurisdiction;* and a new edition, with supplementary chapters, of George Burton Adams's *Constitutional History of England*. As stated in the Report of the Executive Secretary (p. 593), it has become necessary to separate the office of the *Review* from the Washington office of the Association. The address of the *Review* after June 30 will be 535 West 114th Street, New York City. Dr. Schuyler's duties as Managing Editor begin on July 1.

The Beveridge Memorial Fund Committee announces that it will publish the correspondence of James G. Birney, prominent antislavery advocate, which has just been discovered by Professor Dwight L. Dumond of the University of Michigan. Dr. Dumond is anxious to make this publication as complete as possible, and would be glad to hear from anyone who knows of the existence of other Birney letters.

The Thirty-first Annual Meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch was held at Santa Barbara State College on December 27, 28. Among the papers which are of interest for the history of the Coast or the Frontier were: "Dmitry Zavalishin: Dreamer of a Russian-American Empire", by Anatole G. Mazour; "A Chapter of the Pre-history of the Santa Barbara Coast", by David Banks Rogers; "A Transcontinental Railway into Southern California: Texas Pacific versus Southern Pacific, 1867–1880", by Lewis B. Lesley; and "The Attitude of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 toward the West", by Frank H. Garver. "Thirty Years of Party History in British Columbia, 1903–1933", was discussed by Edith Dobie. The history of the Mississippi Valley and of Europe had a share of attention. There was naturally a session on the Far East. The subject of Edward McMahon's Presidential Address was "Lincoln the Emancipator". The officers chosen for this year are Percy A. Martin, president, Joseph B. Lockey, vice-president, and Francis H. Herrick, secretary-treasurer.

The Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, has on hand several hundred copies of vol. II, *Annual Report, 1918*, containing an autobiography of Martin Van Buren. This volume may be had at the

price of $1.00. There is also a large stock of the *Annual Report, 1930,* vol. I, containing a list of manuscript collections, price 75 cents. Both volumes are bound in blue cloth. Orders should be addressed to the Procurement Section.

PERSONAL

Frank Heywood Hodder died on December 27 at the age of 75. He took his master's degree at the University of Michigan in 1883, and afterwards studied at Göttingen and Freiburg. He began his teaching career at Cornell, and in 1891 was appointed professor of American history at the University of Kansas, where he spent the remainder of his career. He was long active in the American Historical Association and was a contributor to various historical journals. Among his publications was *Outline Historical Atlas of the United States* (1900).

George Seymour Godard, Connecticut State librarian, died on February 12 at the age of 70. He was graduated from Wesleyan University with the class of 1892, and from the Yale Divinity School three years later. In 1898 he became assistant state librarian at Hartford, to become librarian in 1900, a position which he held until his death. He was also editor of the Connecticut State Records from 1901. As chairman of various committees he took a deep interest in promoting the study of the history of the state.

James Harvey Robinson died on February 16 at the age of 72. His boyhood influences in Illinois were those of the more generous elements of the New England tradition. At Harvard University, from which he graduated in 1887, gaining an A.M. in 1888, he turned definitely to history, influenced largely by the late Professor Ephraim Emerton. Taking his doctorate at Freiburg in 1890, he chose as the subject of his dissertation the German Bundesrath, and his penetrating analysis of that institution was unique in its field. Returning in 1891, he joined the History Department of the University of Pennsylvania, first as lecturer, then as assistant professor, and with Professor Cheyney, Professor Munro, and others began that series of "Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History" which was in its day a notable instrument of reform in historical method. His chief work was as professor of history at Columbia University from 1895 to 1919. After two more years, at the New School for Social Research, he retired in 1921, to devote himself to research and authorship.

During his early years at Columbia, Professor Robinson's chief courses were those which dealt with the French Revolution and the Protestant Reformation, or, as he termed it, the Protestant Revolt. It is characteristic of his critical method that in both cases he concentrated attention upon the antecedent conditions of these historical movements rather than upon the dramatic details of the crises. The intellectual trends of the eighteenth century were not dealt with in the light of a subsequent revolution, but each

source was analyzed in its own time and setting. Similarly, the study of the Protestant Revolt led to that of the medieval Church, considered in and for itself. The little group of students who in those days constituted Professor Robinson's seminar received an unrivaled training in historical method. They were also given glimpses of that brilliant gift of interpretation and of enlivening the past by juxtaposition with the present, without loss of the historical perspectives, which was Robinson's great gift in exposition.

Later years developed the teacher more and more. He shared the conviction of more than one of the great masters of European historiography that the way to correct the perspectives of the past was to correct them in those early years of student life when history is first taught; and his textbooks of European history were, more than any others, instrumental in remaking the teaching of that history in American schools and colleges. Upon these volumes he labored with scholarly devotion. But to the lasting regret of all those who studied with him or have been influenced by him, it was left for his former students to bring out in their works the outlines of intellectual history which formed the background of his most famous course in Columbia.

Yet the critical attitude toward the data of history which developed throughout these years was shown in those works which made an appeal to the wider reading public, his *Mind in the Making,* his *Humanizing of Knowledge,* and his *Ordeal of Civilization.* Within the historical guild, however, his influence was greatest as the master of the New History, that concept of the reconstructed centuries which has now become almost a commonplace in historical thinking but in which he was a pioneer. Much has been written now about this challenge to accepted ideas; but in recent years the accent has been wrongly placed. It was neither the urge of negative criticism nor the satisfaction of building a new synthesis which led to such notable studies as those on the fall of Rome or the medieval character of much that had passed for a renaissance. His work in this regard was in line with that of the originators of the scientific study of history in the early years of the nineteenth century, when the myths of Rome and antique history were dispelled by textual and higher criticism. Professor Robinson never claimed this high parentage for his New History and would certainly have questioned what he would have regarded as an overdrawn parallel. But the method was the same in the work of Niebuhr and Ranke; and thirty years ago, when he made his first full statement of its implications in a public lecture at Columbia, it stirred historians throughout the whole country. In this address he drew together for the first time the generalized results of his critical analysis of source material, pointing out how very slight are the traces which have been left us from the past, and how delusive are the tendencies toward imaginative reconstruction. Already he was putting that emphasis upon the unconscious, or the subconscious, element

in our thinking which he was to develop in later years into a test of the character of thinking itself. But for more than a decade longer he held his criticism down to the processes of history.

It is not too much to say that had he narrowed his interests down to the traditional limits of history, his achievements would have been more easily appraised by his contemporaries, although they would have been less of an inspiration to a whole generation of history students. But just as he refused to accept the sources of history at second hand, he refused second-hand thinking about the nature of society, or even of man himself. More and more he saw the task of the historian as one that covered all those varied fields of activity which have contributed, obscurely as well as openly, to the structure of our civilization. And so, as those students who studied with him in the early days can testify to the significance of his scientific method, those who followed after drew from him the inspiration of a great conception of human evolution. But as for himself, as the years passed he grew to be a detached observer of what he whimsically insisted upon regarding as the human comedy. J. T. S.

Albert Edward McKinley, professor of history at the University of Pennsylvania, died on February 26 at the age of 65. Before his health failed five years ago, Dr. McKinley had been active as editor and publisher as well as teacher since his graduation from the University of Chicago in 1896. He had been professor of history and dean at Temple University until 1915 when he joined the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania. But he had many other interests. He was one of the first to appreciate the possibilities of laboratory methods in history and organized the McKinley Publishing Company in 1900 to distribute an ever-growing series of maps, charts, tables, illustrated topics, and workbooks. He was also a prominent figure in the multitude of discussions which developed early in the century over the place of history in the curriculums of schools and colleges. To promote this discussion, he established the *History Teachers Magazine* in 1909, which in 1918 became the *Historical Outlook*. This periodical was subsidized for a time (1912–1919) by the American Historical Association and in 1933 Professor McKinley turned over the editorial management of the magazine to that organization, whereupon its name was changed to *Social Studies*. He was interested in the proper care and arrangement of archives. He collaborated with Dr. Herman V. Ames in preparing the report on the Philadelphia Archives for the Public Archives Commission and he served as secretary and organizer of Pennsylvania's War Records Commission. He took his doctor's degree from the University of Pennsylvania in 1904 and published a standard work on *The Suffrage Franchise in the English Colonies*. To his profession he brought a talent for business and organization not usual among his fellows. His colleagues found in him a loyal friend and associate who was always willing to co-operate and to do even more than his share. R. F. N.

John Bigelow, soldier and historian, died on February 29 at the age of 81. His education was begun in Europe while his father was American minister at the court of Napoleon III. He was a student at the School of Mines in Freiberg, Saxony, when he received an appointment to West Point. He graduated with the class of 1877 and afterwards saw service on the Plains. As a captain of cavalry he distinguished himself at San Juan Hill. He first retired in 1904, but returned for staff duty in 1918. For five years he was professor of French at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology where he had taught military science, 1894–1898. He had already published important contributions to military history, *Mars-la-Tour and Gravelotte* in 1884 and *The Principles of Strategy* in 1891 (rev. ed., 1894). His most important work was *The Campaign of Chancellorsville* (1910). In his later years he pursued studies in the field of the "Discoveries" (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVII, 127). A recent contribution to the *American Geographical Review* is listed on another page of this number.

Simon Askenazy, distinguished Polish historian, died on June 22 at the age of 67. His principal labors were in the field of later Polish history, after the partitions, and especially during the Napoleonic period. One of his greatest works was a life of Prince Joseph Poniatowski, which was translated both into German and French. His *Manuscrits de Napoléon en Pologne* (1929) was of special interest to students of the period.

Charles George Crump, formerly of the Public Record Office, died in December at the age of 73. He was a Balliol man and first entered the Indian Civil Service in which two brothers rose to distinction. Ill health compelled his return to England and in 1888 he began his career in the Public Record Office, where he served for 35 years. He was made assistant keeper in 1916. To his work is attributed much of the emphasis upon public records as sources of exact knowledge on the machinery of government, especially in the more remote periods of British history. He was joint editor of the *Dialogus de Saccario* (1902). With Professor E. F. Jacob he edited *The Legacy of the Middle Ages* (1926). He was author of *The Logic of History* (1919) and *History and Historical Research* (1928).

Jacques Bainville, academician, journalist, and historian, died on February 9 at the age of 57. In the French Academy, to which he was chosen last year, he occupied the chair vacated by the death of Raymond Poincaré. He was one of the editors of the *Action française*. His historical works, written from the point of view of an ardent royalist, had a vast popularity, especially his *Histoire de France*, of which the first edition appeared in 1924. This was published in the United States also, in a translation by Alice and Christian Gauss. He wrote a volume on *Napoléon* (1931), which was translated. He was also interested in Bismarck and one of his earliest historical writings was *Bismarck et la France d'après les Mémoires du prince von Hohenlohe* (1918).

Charles Harding Firth, professor emeritus of Modern history at Oxford University, died on February 19 at the age of 78. His teaching career at Oxford began as early as 1883 and continued until 1925, when he retired. He held the Regius Professorship from 1904. After Samuel R. Gardiner's death Firth was regarded as the most eminent historian for the English seventeenth century. One of his latest works was a continuation of Gardiner's unfinished history of the Commonwealth and Protectorate. This appeared in two volumes in 1909 and was entitled *The Last Years of the Protectorate, 1656–1658.* He had intended to bring the work down to the Restoration. In the long list of previous publications some of the most notable were: *Cromwell* [Heroes of the Nations] (1900), *Cromwell's Army* (1902), and the *House of Lords during the Civil War* (1910). He edited many volumes, *The Clarke Papers* (4 vols., 1891–1901), *Scotland and the Commonwealth: Letters and Papers* (2 vols., 1895, 1899), Carlyle's *Letters and Speeches of Cromwell* (1904). In 1915 he published an edition of ballads (*An American Garland*) relating to America of the period 1563–1759.

The late Dr. Clarence W. Bowen is the subject of an article by John R. Totten in the *New York Genealogical and Biographical Register.* It will be recalled that Dr. Bowen was president of the society which publishes the *Register* from 1907 to 1931.

Tributes are paid to the memory of Dr. Lyon G. Tyler in the October *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* by James Southall Wilson and J. G. Bohannon. There is also a paper by Dr. Tyler entitled "William and Mary College and its Influence on the Founding of the Republic". An address by Dr. Tyler on "The Old South", delivered at Petersburg on Memorial Day, June 9, 1934, is published in *Tyler's Quarterly Historial and Genealogical Magazine* for January.

A memoir of the late Major General A. W. Greely, by Harold C. Durrell, appears in the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register.*

Scripps College has issued as one of its Bulletins a number *In Memoriam: Nathaniel Wright Stephenson.* Among the tributes which it contains are "As Colleague", by William S. Ament, professor of English, and "As Biographer and Historian", by Frank W. Pitman, professor of History. There is also a bibliography.

Among the many appreciative essays evoked by the death of the eminent Belgian historian Henri Pirenne are: François L. Ganshof, "Henri Pirenne: Le Maître, l'Historien" (*Le Flambeau,* Dec.); Fernand Vercauteren, "In memoriam Henri Pirenne" (*Bulletin du Cercle des Alumni de la Fondation Universitaire,* Brussels, Dec.); F. M. Powicke, "Henri Pirenne" (*Eng. Hist. Rev.,* Jan.); L. van der Essen, "Henri Pirenne et l'histoire ecclésiastique"

(*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, Jan.) and F. Quicke, "Henri Pirenne, 1862–1935" (*Rev. Belge Phil. et Hist.*, Oct.). G. C. B.

The strange, sensitive, almost exotic character of the late Stephen d'Irsay and his paradoxical career as physiologist, expert in cardiac diseases, and historian are described with sympathetic understanding by two of his friends. Dr. Henry E. Sigerist has written an essay, "Stephen d'Irsay, 1894–1934" (with a supplementary bibliography of D'Irsay's writings), and Dr. John Rathbone Oliver contributes "Personal Reminiscences of Stephen d'Irsay"; both are found in the *Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine*, III, no. 6 (June). G. C. B.

Professor John E. Pomfret is on sabbatical leave from Princeton University during this second term.

Dr. Paul Vanorden Shaw, for many years at Columbia University, has accepted the professorship of the History of American Civilization in the University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil.

The Carl Schurz Foundation has invited Dr. Charles C. Tansill to visit Germany from September 1 to October 15 to lecture in several German universities on German-American relations, 1870–1914.

Dr. Roscoe R. Hill, chief of the Division of Classification in the National Archives, is on leave at the request of Secretary Ickes and has gone to acquaint the republics of South America with the purposes of the Second Congress of the International Committee on Large Dams and the Third World Power Conference. These conferences are to be held in Washington in September. Dr. Hill on this trip will also inspect the archives establishments of the countries he visits. He left on February 11 and will be back in Washington by the end of April.

Professor E. L. Bogart of the University of Illinois is spending a semester's leave of absence in Europe.

Dr. James Alton James has been elected president of the Illinois Historical Society, succeeding the late Dr. Otto L. Schmidt.

At the University of Chicago Louis Gottschalk has been promoted to be professor of Modern history, the appointment beginning last October; Herrlee G. Creel was appointed instructor in Chinese history and language in January; and J. Fred Rippy has been appointed professor of American history, his work to begin next October.

Announcement is made of the appointment of visiting professors for the summer sessions of the following universities: *British Columbia*, F. Lee Benns; *California* [Berkeley], Lawrence Kinnaird for the Intersession, Joseph B. Lockey, Klaus Mehnert; [Los Angeles], David Saville Muzzey; *Colorado*, William C. Binkley; *Columbia*, Charles W. Cole, Henry S. Com-

mager, Carl Stephenson, A. A. Vasiliev; *Cornell,* Leo Gershoy; *Harvard,* Dietrich Gerhard, R. F. Nichols, F. L. Nussbaum, S. M. Pargellis; *Johns Hopkins,* St. Julien Ravenel Childs; *Indiana,* John D. Barnhart, Harry Howard; *Michigan,* P. A. Martin, R. N. Reynolds; *Minnesota,* Curtis H. Walker, first term, Reginald I. Lovell, second term; *Missouri,* Edward Everett Dale, Glenn W. Gray, John W. Oliver; *Northwestern,* George M. Dutcher; *Pennsylvania State,* A. T. Volwiler, O. H. Wedel; *Southern California,* James A. James, Clarence Perkins; *Texas,* L. B. Schmidt for the first term, R. N. Richardson and Ralph Steen for the second term, J. A. Barnes, Cardinal Goodwin, J. O. Van Hook, C. F. Ward for both terms; *Washington,* W. B. Hesseltine; *West Virginia,* Harold J. Grimm and O. D. Lambert for the first term, Walter Prescott Webb for the second term; *Wisconsin,* Louis M. Sears.

GENERAL

General review: Henri Sée, *Histoire économique et sociale, 1932–1933* [concl'd] (Rev. Hist., Nov.); P. Henry, *Histoire de Roumanie* (*ibid.*).

The Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, held at Boston, December 26-28, is reported the most successful in that association's history. The Presidential Address of Professor Jeremiah D. M. Ford had as its theme the Ciceronian Dictum of History (*Catholic Historical Review,* XXI, 385-399). Nine other papers were read, and there were three luncheon conferences at one of which Professor Samuel E. Morison discussed the "Catholic Traditions of Early Harvard". Mr. Daniel Sargent was elected president, Professor Herbert C. F. Bell first vice-president, the Very Rev. Dr. Valentine T. Schaaf, O. F. M., second vice-president, the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Peter Guilday secretary, and the Rev. Dr. John K. Cartwright treasurer.

The Naval War College has issued *International Law Situations with Solutions and Notes, 1934* (Government Printing Office, pp. 126, 75 cents),[1] prepared, as for many previous years, by Professor George Grafton Wilson.

A Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles, upon which work has been proceeding for a decade at the University of Chicago, under the general editorship of Sir William Craigie, and with the assistance of many volunteer workers, is now approaching the period of publication, the exact time being dependent upon receiving a sufficient number of subscriptions. It is planned to issue the dictionary in twenty parts at a total price of $50.

The Council of the Royal Historical Society has announced a plan of publishing a list of *Writings on English History* to begin with the year 1934.

[1] Volumes mentioned in the Historical News were published in 1935 unless another date is indicated.

It is intended to correspond to similar works in the United States, France, and Germany, *Writings on American History, Répertoire bibliographique de l'histoire de France,* and *Jahresberichte der deutschen Geschichte.* Mr. A. T. Milne, the editor of the work, is to enter upon his duties on July 1.

The Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth is distributing to subscribers cards recording references to books and articles on the different problems of Egyptian archaeology and philology. It expects to send out annually approximately 600 such cards. It hopes to receive notice from scholars of articles in this field, especially those which appear in reviews not designated as Egyptological. Subscriptions to this service cost 10 belgas, sent by draft to the Fondation, Brussels.

The November number of the *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale* is a special number, the first of a series, devoted to "Les techniques, l'histoire et la vie". After introductory "Réflexions sur l'histoire des techniques", by Lucien Febvre, there are two monographs: "Avènement et conquêtes du moulin à eau", by Marc Bloch; and "Les transformations du gouvernail", by G. de la Roërie. Then follow a portrait, "Frédéric Winslow Taylor: L'optimisme d'un ingénieur", by G. Friedmann, and an "enquête" on "La forge de village", by Lucien Febvre. The general reviews emphasize the same phases of history. It is not necessary to insist on the importance of this number.

A work of interest to the student of geographic influences in history is *Manuel géographique de politique européenne,* vol. I (Paris, Delagrave, 1936, pp. 472, 123 illustrations, 90 fr.), by Jacques Ancel.

A dozen years ago H. Aschehoug, a prominent publishing house in Oslo, undertook to bring out an extensive history of the Norwegian people in which the emphasis should be laid on social and economic life and conditions. The work was assigned to four eminent scholars, with the understanding that each was to have full freedom to deal with his period from his own point of view. Edvard Bull, who was to write the history of the later Middle Ages, died before his assignment was finished and his part of the task was taken up and completed by Sigvald Hasund. The publication began in 1929 and the series was brought to completion in 1935. While all the volumes (there are ten in all) have their individual excellences, Haakon Shetelig's treatment of the Norwegian people in its prehistoric and early historic centuries and Sverre Steen's account of the Dano-Norwegian period (1500–1814) have called forth the greatest praise (*Det norske folks liv og historie gjennem tidene,* by Edvard Bull, Wilhelm Keilhau, *et al.*). L. M. L.

Two important contributions have recently been made upon the problem of war: *The Causes of War and the Conditions of Peace* (Longmans, Green, pp. xi, 148, $2.00), by Quincy Wright, professor of International Law at the University of Chicago, and *By Pacific Means* (Yale University Press,

pp. vi, 200, $2.50), by Manley O. Hudson, member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. Professor Wright's volume is made up of lectures delivered at the Graduate Institute of International Studies in Geneva. In his preface he explains that they constitute a prospectus of the synthesis toward which he and his colleagues at Chicago have been working since 1927, in a project of which he is the director. In addition to the five lectures there is a substantial list of books and articles on the general subject. Professor Hudson's volume consists of four addresses delivered last March at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. About half of the volume is devoted to documents illustrative of the questions involved, from The Hague Convention of 1907 to the Saavedra-Lamas Anti-War Treaty of October, 1933.

The occasion of the writing of *Woman's Education Begins: the Rise of the Women's Colleges* (Wheaton College Press, pp. xi, 295, $2.00), by Louise Schutz Boas, was the hundredth anniversary of Wheaton College. The author does not emphasize Wheaton in this study, but traces the general development of women's colleges during the period of organization in the thirties to the end of the nineteenth century. She emphasizes the "social conditions which brought about the education of women". It is interesting to see the influence of the Civil War in this connection. E. D. S.

Among the notable books which deal with the problems of the present in the light of past experience are *Farewell to Revolution* (W. W. Norton, pp. xv, 380, $3.00), by Everett Dean Martin; *The Man with a Country* (Bobbs-Merrill, pp. 334, $2.50), by Frederick Palmer; and *Hold Fast the Middle Way* (Little, Brown, pp. xi, 238, $1.75), by John Dickinson.

Professor Boutelle Ellsworth Lowe has revised and enlarged his *The International Protection of Labor: International Labor Organization, History and Law* (Macmillan, pp. lxxiii, 594, $3.50), originally published in 1921. The treatment now includes the story of the movement through the Eighteenth Session at Geneva in 1934.

Among the personages described in *Four Independents* (Sheed and Ward, pp. 243, $2.00), by Daniel Sargent, is Orestes A. Brownson. Another is Paul Claudel, formerly French ambassador.

Honoring the seventieth birthday of Professor Hans Nirrnheim, former director of the State Archives of Hamburg and president of the Society for Hamburg History, his colleagues and students presented to him a collection of twelve essays and lectures published under the title *Festschrift Hans Nirrnheim* (Hamburger Geschichtliche Beiträge, Boysen and Maasch, Hamburg, pp. 244, 2.50 M.). All but one of the articles deal with some phase of the history of Hamburg or some personality connected with the development of the city. Most interesting to American readers, perhaps, is F. Keutgen's twenty-five page study of the "Origin and Development of

the German Hansa". The last section of the book is devoted to a complete bibliography of Nirrnheim's works. M. S. E.

Professor T. W. Riker's *Short History of Modern Europe* (Macmillan, pp. xiii, 890, $3.50) is intended primarily for underclassmen. It makes a novel approach to the subject in a long introduction entitled "The Coming of the Modern Age", with excursions into the period before to furnish a setting. No separate sections are given to the Renaissance or the Reformation. The style is vigorous and attractive. The volume is well equipped with maps and reference lists.

J. Hampden Jackson has edited a textbook on a novel plan. Entitled *A Modern History of Europe, 1046–1918* (Harpers, pp. 1236, $3.00), it is divided into four parts, 1046–1494, 1494–1714, 1714–1815, 1815–1918. The section on the Middle Ages is assigned to a Roman Catholic, Oliver J. G. Welch, on the supposition that no one without an "inner knowledge of the spirit of Catholicism" can describe medievalism. In the second section, by C. J. Pennethorne Hughes, stress is laid upon economic changes, in the third, by H. E. Howard, on diplomacy, and in the fourth, by P. C. Gordon Walker, "the history of the nineteenth century has been shown as leading to the War".

In *The Symbols of Government* (Yale University Press, pp. vi, 278, $2.50) Professor Thurman W. Arnold proceeds on the theory that "Institutions . . . develop institutional habits. . . . They build for themselves little dramas, and play varied rôles." He means by symbols of government "the ceremonies and theories of social institutions". Analysis of our judicial system is made under the caption of "Trial by Combat".

A survey to list all motion pictures which have an educational value is being conducted jointly by the U. S. Office of Education and the American Council on Education in Washington. This includes not only the strict classroom film, but subjects useful to medical students, scientific workers, vocational classes, CCC camps, teachers, and other specialized educational groups. The survey is being made under a grant from the General Education Board (Rockefeller) and is part of the work being carried on by the American Council on Education in connection with its sponsorship of the proposed American Educational Film Institute. More than 10,000 film catalogue cards have been mailed to 1800 sources of films in this country. Both agencies co-operating in this survey desire that this central information file be made as complete as possible. Further information may be obtained from the American Council on Education at 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

For a period of ten weeks, from June 22 to August 29, the University of California will conduct intensive instruction in the Russian language—one

course for beginners, and one for persons with some knowledge of Russian. This work is offered by the University in co-operation with the Institute of Pacific Relations, as a continuation of the inter-university project which began with the Russian Language Section of the Harvard Summer School of 1934 and was carried on at Columbia during the Summer of 1935. The courses are intended for persons of exceptional qualifications who have a specific need for the languages as a tool for use in some field of science or of scholarship. The Summer Session Office of the University of California is prepared to furnish detailed information upon request.

The Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America will hold its Eleventh Annual Seminar in Cuernavaca and Mexico City from July 9 to July 29. Detailed information may be had of Hubert Herring, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

Professor W. Menzies Whitelaw, of Sarah Lawrence College, will again direct Queen's University Summer School of Historical Research at Ottawa. The school is in session from July 3 to August 14.

Articles: Carlton J. H. Hayes, *History and the Present* (Social Studies, Feb.); Francis W. Coker, *American Traditions concerning Property and Liberty* [Presidential Address, American Political Science Association] (Am. Pol. Sci. Rev., Feb.); Charles H. Wesley, *The Reconstruction of History* (Jour. Negro Hist., Oct.); J. A. R. Marriott, *History and Politics* (Quar. Rev., Jan.); David Thomson, *The Philosophy of Writing History* (*ibid.*); C. H. McIlwain, *Government by Law* (Foreign Affairs, Jan.); Charles Warren, *Safeguards to Neutrality* (*ibid.*); A. V. Judges, *Les archives privées et l'histoire: Pour la conservation et l'utilisation des archives d'entreprises en Grande Bretagne* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., Sept.); Richard Hartshorne, *Recent Developments in Political Geography* [II] (Am. Pol. Sci. Rev., Dec.); Georges Vadja, *L'état actuel des recherches sur les origines de l'Islam* (Rev. Synthèse, Dec.); Max Gunzenhäuser, *Die Leistungen des Auslandes auf dem Gebiet der Weltkriegsbibliographie* (Berl. Monatsh., Feb.); James Hornell, *British Coracles* (Mariner's Mirror, Jan.); Charles F. McCombs, compiler, *French Printing through 1650: a Check List of Books in the New York Public Library* (Bull. New York Public Library, Feb.); David Riesman, *Three Quarters of a Century of Medical Progress* (Sci. Monthly, Feb.); G. Wrede, *Zur historischen Raumforschung in Nordwestdeutschland* (Hist. Zeitsch., Jan.); Walter Fitzgerald, *The Impact of Western Civilization on Negro Africa* (Geograph. Rev., Jan.).

ANCIENT HISTORY

The following reports of recent excavations and new discoveries are worthy of notice: The Oriental Institute report on the Near East, by C. R. Hughes, in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages* for January; R.

Ghirshman's report on excavations at Tepe Sialk in *Syria,* XVI, no. 3; K. Bittel and H. G. Guterbock on the fourth campaign at Bogaz Köi in the *Abhandlungen* of the Prussian Academy, 1935, no. 1; H. Goldman on excavations at Tarsus in 1935, C. W. Blegen on those at Troy, J. L. Caskey on new inscriptions from Troy, T. L. Shear on the Agora excavations, and E. P. Blegen's news items from Athens, all in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for December; reviews of excavations and discoveries in 1934, by P. Lemerle, in the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique,* LIX, no. 1, and of archaeology in Greece, 1934–1935, by H. G. G. Payne, in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies,* LV, no. 2; an account of discoveries at Olynthus, by D. M. Robinson, in *Die Antike,* XI, no. 4; reviews of Gallo-Roman antiquities, by A. Grenier, of Narbonese finds, by R. Demangel, and finds in Holland, by A. Roes, in the *Revue des études anciennes* for December; and finally reports on Roman Britain, 1934, in the *Journal of Roman Studies,* XXV, no. 2.

In *Bursian's Jahresbericht,* vol. CCLI, J. Mesk reviews the literature on Xenophon, 1930–1934, and A. Hauser that on Plutarch's Lives, 1909–1934; in vol. CCLIII T. Lenschau surveys the literature on Greek history, 1932–1934, and H. Kasten continues his review of the progress of Greek epigraphy from 1895 to 1934 to include Galatia, Isauria, Pisidia, and Pamphylia. Mention must be made of M. N. Tod's masterly review of the literature on Greek inscriptions, 1933–1934, in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies,* LV, no. 2.

Some archaeological articles of historical importance include Y. Bequignon's Thessalian studies in the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique,* LIX, no. 1; some notes on early Greek inscriptions on metal, by S. Casson, in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for December; interpretations of reliefs of Phalerum, Rhodes, and Chios, by H. Bloch, in the *Rivista di filologia* for September; and R. von Uslar on German pottery from Kastell Zugmantel in the Taunus as evidence of German settlement, in *Klio,* XXVIII, no. 3.

The following articles have some importance for their criticisms of ancient documents and literary sources: S. Accame on elections of Athenian *strategoi* in the fifth century in *Rivista di filologia* for September; M. L. Kambanis on the chronology of Athenian coinage, G. Daux's epigraphical notes, L. Robert's studies in the inscriptions and topography of Central Greece, and P. Flacelière on third century inscriptions of Delphi, all in the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique,* LIX, no. 1; A. Momigliano on some dates in the life of Epicurus in *Rivista di filologia* for September; A. Wilhelm on the letter of King Antigonus to the Teians in *Klio,* XXVIII, no. 3; J. E. Fontenrose's notes on Milesian inscriptions in the *American Journal of Philology* for January; E. Kalinka on the saga of Rome's founding in *Neue Jahrbücher,* XI, no. 5; G. De Sanctis on Callimachus and Horatius Cocles in the *Rivista di filologia* for September; K. Siegler's studies in

Plutarch in the *Rheinisches Museum,* LXXXIV, no. 4; and L. Herrmann on the prodigy of the Rubicon in the December number of the *Revue des études anciennes.*

The following articles possess some importance for students of ancient economic history: Herodotus's trade route to the Siberian Issedoni, by R. Hennig, in *Klio,* XXVIII, no. 3; the upkeep of "sacred houses" on Delos, by P. H. Davis, in the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique,* LIX, no. 1; Sir George Macdonald on the dating-values of Samian ware, A. Blakeway on some aspects of the earliest hellenization of Latium and Etruria, and D. B. Harden on Romano-Syrian glasses with mould-blown inscriptions, all in the *Journal of Roman Studies,* XXV, no. 2; W. Schwahn on the services of the Sicilian *Decumani* in *Hermes,* LXX, no. 4; M. Hofmann on the last Quintilii Vari and their villa at Tivoli in *Historische Vierteljahrschrift,* XXX, no. 2; T. Frank on the export tax of Spanish harbors in the *American Journal of Philology* for January; C. H. Sutherland on the state of the imperial treasury at Domitian's death in the *Journal of Roman Studies,* XXV, no. 2; and finally, A. Séguin's study of petroleum in antiquity in the January number of the *Revue des questions historiques.*

Professor G. D. Hadzsits's book on *Lucretius and his Influence,* in Our Debt to Greece and Rome series (Longmans, 1935), most concerns students of literature and philosophy. It is a book of considerable literary charm, and gives a good picture both of the relation of Lucretius to his own times and the regard of later periods for him.

The Greek *ostraca* of the Charles Edwin Wilbur collection in the Museum of Brooklyn have been published by Claire Préaux under the auspices of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences and the Queen Elizabeth Egyptological Foundation. There are 78 documents, mostly tax receipts, of types which can be paralleled elsewhere in larger collections. Each text is published with a translation and a good commentary. The whole is arranged for convenience according to whether the tax was paid in money or in kind, and was of Ptolemaic or of Roman date. There are also a few administrative documents, a permit granted by a *histonarches,* administration of goods confiscated by the state, lists of persons liable to the *corvée,* etc.

Articles: A. Scharff, *Neues zur Frage der ältesten ägyptisch-babylonischen Kulturbeziehungen* (Zeitsch. f. Ägypt. Sprache, LXXI, no. 2); H. Kees, *Kulttopographische und mythologische Beiträge* (*ibid.*); J. W. Jack, *La situation religieuse d'Israel au temps d'Achab* (Rev. Hist. Religions, Dec.); C. H. Gordon, *Fratriarchy in the Old Testament* (Jour. Bibl. Lit., Dec.); A. Brock-Utne, *"Der Feind": Die alttestamentliche Satansgestalt im Lichte der sozialen Verhältnisse des nahen Orients* (Klio, XXVIII, no. 3); Edward Robertson, *The Disruption of Israel's Monarchy—Before and After*

(Bull. John Rylands Library, Jan.); F. Matz, *Die kretisch-mykenische Kultur und ihre alteuropäischen Beziehungen* (Zeitsch. f. Ethnol., LXVI); A. R. Burn, *Dates in Early Greek History* (Jour. Hell. Stud., LV, no. 2); J. A. O. Larsen, *Perioeci in Crete* (Class. Philol., Jan.); L. Pearson, *Propaganda in the Archidamian War* (*ibid.*); F. Miltner, *Pro Leonida* (Klio, XXVIII, no. 3); A. Solari, *Intorno alla reazione sociale del 408–410* (*ibid.*); F. Graefe, *Die Operationen des Antalkidas im Hellespont* (*ibid.*); A. Semenov, *Hypereides und Phryne* (*ibid.*); M. Hadas, *Observations on Athenian Women* (Class. Weekly, Feb. 3); G. Daux, *Craton, Eumène II et Attale II* (Bull. Corr. Hell., LIX, no. 1); H. Henne, *Note sur le début du règne conjoint de Philemétor et d'Euergète II* (Rev. Études Anc., Dec.); M. Guarducci, *Orgeoni e tiasoti* (Riv. Filol., Sept.); E. T. Sage and A. J. Wegner, *Administrative Commissions and the Official Career, 218–167 B. C.* (Class. Philol., Jan.); F. L. Jones, *Crassus, Caesar, Catiline* (Class. Weekly, Jan. 27); S. L. Mohler, *Sentina rei publicae: Campaign Issues, 63 B. C.* (*ibid.*, Jan. 20); A. Schulten, *Die Schlacht bei Munda* (Rhein. Museum, LXXXIV, no. 4); E. Bickermann, *Utilitas Crucis: Observations sur les récits du procès de Jésus dans les Evangiles canoniques* (Rev. Hist. Rel., Dec.); F. Taeger, *Zum Kampf gegen den antiken Herrscherkult* (Archiv f. Religionswissensch., XXXII, nos. 3–4); W. M. Calder, *Silius Italicus in Asia* (Class. Rev., Dec.); A. Neumann, *Kritische Beiträge zur römischen Heeresdisciplin des 1. und 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Klio. XXVIII, no. 3); *id., Das augusteischhadrianische Armeereglement und Vegetius* (Class. Philol., Jan.).

T. R. S. B.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Isis for December publishes the Forty-third critical bibliography of the history and philosophy of science and of the history of civilization to the end of February, 1935. This survey refers especially to the fourteenth century and to Asia.

In an unusual place, forming No. 22 of the *Subsidia Hagiographica* published by the Society of Bollandists at Brussels, will be found a curious body of material concerning Henry VI of England, *Henrici VI Angliae Regis miracula postuma* (pp. 262 of prolegomena and 328 of text), edited from British Museum MS. Royal 13. C. VIII. It contains many narratives taken down from the lips of pilgrims by canons of Windsor, and especially by Dean John Morgan, and presents some useful material respecting the king's reign and death, as well as matter illustrative of contemporary manners. J. F. J.

The old and much controverted problem of the origin of a privileged aristocracy in the Northern kingdoms has been made the subject of a study by Karl-Erik Löfquist entitled *Om riddarväsen och frälse i nordisk medeltid* (Lund, pp. xv, 279). While admitting the possibility of native origins, the

author is inclined to emphasize the influence of baronial systems in neighboring lands. L. M. L.

The second volume of the *Correspondance* of Loup de Ferrières, edited and translated into French by Léon Levillain (Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres"), covers the years 847–862. Vol. I for the years 829–847 appeared in 1927 (Honoré Champion). Besides the Latin and French texts, the second volume has the index for the two volumes, additions and corrections for vol. I, and a Concordance des éditions. This is No. 16 of Les classiques de l'histoire de France. G. C. B.

As one might suppose, the conclusions of Dr. Max Hackelsperger, the author of *Bibel und mittelalterlicher Reichsgedanke: Studien und Beiträge zum Gebrauch der Bibel im Streit zwischen Kaisertum und Papsttum zur Zeit der Salier* (Bottrop i. W., Wilhelm Postberg, 1934, pp. xvii, 137), are that the Bible was a most highly esteemed weapon in the Investiture Conflict. He points out, though, that it was a weapon used not so much for compelling arguments as for striking force and real punch in that fanatical battle of opinion. E. D. S.

Articles: G. Bardy, *Faux et fraudes littéraires dans l'antiquité chrétienne* [I] (Rev. Hist. Ecclés., Jan.); J. Gazay, *De l'influence des moins irlandais dans l'Église provençale au début du moyen âge* (An. Midi, July); J. N. L. Myres, *The Teutonic Settlement of Northern England* [Historical Revision, LXXX] (History, Dec.); J. Declareuil, *Aux origines conjuguées de l'Évangile et de l'État allemand* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Nov.); P. Bonenfant, *La notice de donation du domaine de Leeuw à l'église de Cologne et le problème de la colonisation saxonne en Brabant* (Rev. Belge Philol. et Hist., Sept.); E. Sabbe, *L'importation des tissus orientaux en Europe occidentale au haut moyen âge, IX^e et X^e siècles* [I] (*ibid.*); Nils Åberg, *Det nordiska stenaldersområdet* [the geographical limits of the stone age in the North] (Fornvännen); Gunnar Ekholm, *Gallisk-Skandinaviska förbindelser under äldre kejsartid* (*ibid.*); Philip Grierson, *Eudes I^er, évêque de Beauvais* (Moyen Age, July); Willi Koemel, *Beiträge zur Verfassungsgeschichte Roms in 10. Jahrhundert* (Hist. Jahrbuch, XLV, no. 4); Karl Pivec, *Die Briefsammlung Gerberts von Aurillac* (Mitteil. Österr. Inst. f. Geschichtsf., XLIX, nos. 1–2); Philip Grierson, *A Visit of Earl Harold to Flanders, 1056* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Jan.); H. E. Butler, *Some new pages of Giraldus Cambrensis* (Medium Aevum, Oct.); Albert Brackmann, *Reichspolitik und Ostpolitik im frühen Mittelalter* (Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Philol.-Hist. Kl., 1935, XXXII); Bernhard Stasiewski, *Die Anfänge der Regierung Boleslaw Chrobrys* (Zeitsch. f. Osteur. Gesch., 1935, no. 4); Georges Espinas, *Pour une histoire urbaine comparée: Villes italiennes et villes flamandes* (Rev. Synthèse, Dec.); P. Thomas, *Le movement franciscain dans la région lyonnaise au XIII^e siècle* (Études Francis., Sept.); D. von Kralok, *Die*

Heimat der Nibelungen: Ein Beitrag zur Klärung des Verhältnisses zwischen mittelaltlicher Dichtung und Geschichte (Byzant. Zeitsch., XXXV, no. 2); C. H. Taylor, *New Texts on the Assembly of 1302* (Speculum, Jan.); H. S. Lucas, *Diplomatic Relations between England and Flanders, 1329–1336* (*ibid.*); F. M. Powicke, *The Archbishop of Rouen, John de Harcourt, and Simon de Montfort* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Jan.); Anthony Steel, *English Government Finance, 1377–1413* [I] (*ibid.*); H. G. Richardson, *Heresy and the Lay Power under Richard II* (*ibid.*); C. R. Cheney, *Norwich Cathedral Priory in the Fourteenth Century* (Bull. John Rylands Library, Jan.); H. Focillon, *Une forteresse franque de Syrie* [*Crac des Chevaliers*] (An. Midi, July); J. Ferté, *Rapports de la Somme d'Alexandre de Hales dans son 'De fide' avec Philippe le Chancelier* (Recherch. Théol. Anc. et Méd., Oct.); J. Koch, *Neue Aktenstücke zu dem gegen Wilhelm Ockham in Avignon geführten Prozess* (*ibid.*); F. Valls-Taberner, *La cour comtale barcelonaise* (Rev. Hist. Droit Fr. et Étr., Oct.); M. C. Daviso, *Filippo senza terra: La sua rebellione nel 1462 e le sue relazione con Francesco Sforza e Luigi IX* (Riv. Stor. Ital., Jan.); Karl Fiehn, *Die Geschichte der Marienklöster Harsefelde* (*Rosenfelde*) *und Stade* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Nov.); J. de Sturber, *Une démarche politique inconnue de Jean III, duc de Brabant, 1337–1338* (Rev. Belge Phil. et Hist., Oct.); H. Nelis, *Style d'Utrecht aux quatre métiers à la fin du moyen âge* (*ibid.*); A. D. Menuet, *Latin MSS. of the 'Nicomachean Ethics' à la Bibliothèque nationale* (*ibid.*); W. Kienast, *Die Anfänge des europäischen Staatensystems im späteren Mittelalter* (Hist. Zeitsch., Jan.); B.-A. Pocquet du Haut-Jussé, *Le connétable de Richemont seigneur bourguignon* (An. Bourgogne, Dec.); A. Voisin, *Le 'mutemaque' du 26 juin 1477: Notes sur l'opinion à Dijon au lendemain de la Réunion* (*ibid.*); Paul Jeulin, *Un grand 'Honneur' anglais: Aperçus sur le 'Comté' de Richmond en Angleterre* (An. Bretagne, XLII, nos. 3–4); G. G. Coulton, *Nationalism in the Middle Ages* (Cam. Hist. Jour., 1935, no. 1); Oscar Albert Johnsen, *Norges nedgang i senmiddelalderen* [Norwegian decline in the later Middle Ages] (Nordisk Tidskr., 1935, no. 6); Johan Schreiner, *Norge og Unionskongedömmet i det 14. århundrede* [Norway and the union in the fourteenth century] (Hist. Tidsskr. [Norw.], 1935, no. 4); Mary C. Welborn, *Studies in Medieval Metrology* (Isis, Dec.); A. A. Vasiliev, *The Foundation of the Empire of Trebizond* (Speculum, Jan.).

G. C. B.

FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

It seems likely that most scholars will continue to prefer some of the older studies about Joan to this new book by Mr. Milton Waldman (*Joan of Arc,* Little, Brown, pp. 338, $3.50); none will take seriously the blurb implying that at last the Maid has been rescued from a "stifling envelope of legend"; and some may be disposed to find occasional errors of fact or

emphasis. Nevertheless all will probably agree that here is a vivid, well-written retelling of a unique, dramatic story. The author bases his tale on the accumulated research of the past half century, making available in popular and attractive, if somewhat summary, form the results of much scholarship. Joan and her Voices still remain as much an enigma as before, even if Mr. Waldman suggests that she may have had some clairvoyant power. It is also still possible to have doubts as to whether or not she was a military genius despite the author's arguments that she was. Needless to say this volume does not endorse Seignobos's comment that Joan was merely an Armagnac partisan. R. A. N.

The three lectures included in the volume entitled *The Medical Man and the Witch during the Renaissance,* by Gregory Zilboorg, M.D. [The Hideyo Noguchi Lectures, Institute of the History of Medicine, The Johns Hopkins University] (Johns Hopkins Press, 1935, pp. x, 215, $2.50), may be of some interest to the general reader but have no value for the advanced student. They deal with such well-worn topics as the *Malleus maleficarum* and the work of Johannes Weyer, as our author spells it, with some reference to the present interest in the history of psychiatry. Like other recent works on witchcraft, the devil, and the belief in demons, this work suffers from a lack of knowledge of previous medieval discussion of such points. L. T.

The fifth and concluding volume of *Urkunden zur Schweizer Geschichte aus österreichischen Archiven* (Basel, Birkhäuser, pp. 383), edited by Rudolf Thommen, covers the period from 1480 to 1499, the year of the peace of Basel. The documents incidentally throw considerable light upon imperial relations.

The aim of the small volume entitled *L'annoblissement en France au temps de François I* (Alcan, 1934, pp. 216, 15 fr.), by Jean Richard Bloch, is to find a definition of noble status, rather than remain content with enumerating certain honors, franchises, rights, and privileges usually associated with it. There were three general ways of reaching such a status, by prescription, by becoming part of a collectivity, a member of a court, for example, and by receiving a grant from the crown. To attain a satisfactory definition of ennoblement in all these categories, the author explains, we must go to royal acts and to decisions in contentious cases, as well as to the treatises of the early jurists. He has chosen the reign of Francis because it marks a transition period. The era of the military or feudal nobility had come to a close; the modern state was beginning. M. Bloch's conclusions are based upon a wide examination of documentary material preserved in the great French collections. One of his most interesting chapters is a catalogue of 183 persons who received nobility by grant from Francis, including in many cases ample quotations from the documents.

The Belgian Commission royale d'histoire has issued a volume of im-

portant documents upon the aftermath of the "Ladies Peace", *Correspondance de Marguerite d'Autriche et de ses ambassadeurs à la Cour de France concernant l'exécution du Traité de Cambrai, 1529–1530* (Lamertin, pp. xxv, 270), edited by Ghislaine de Boom. They come from the Lalaing family archives and have been hitherto practically inaccessible. They are in two parts, the first including the correspondence between Marguerite and her envoys, Philippe de Lalaing and Francis de Bonvalot. There is also some correspondence exchanged with the ambassadors of the Emperor Charles. In the second part are letters from Philippe Lalaing to his father, Antoine, the principal confident of Marguerite. There are also the father's replies. The manuscripts are copies, made apparently by a secretary of Lalaing. Those who recall the bitterness of the strife between Francis I and the emperor even after peace was formally concluded will welcome the additional light which this correspondence throws upon the whole situation.

Erik XIV's engelska underhandlingar, by Ingvar Andersson (Lund, pp. viii, 192), is an account of the negotiations carried on by the erratic Swedish king with the government of Elizabeth in the first decade of the queen's reign. These are concerned largely with Erik's proposal to marry Elizabeth; but the author believes that, in addition to achieving a brilliant marriage, the king hoped to promote Swedish trade and to secure a powerful ally against the menacing power of his Danish neighbor. L. M. L.

Catholicism, Protestantism, and Capitalism, by Amintore Fanfani (Sheed and Ward, pp. v, 224, $2.00), is a concise, scholarly, and liberal contribution to a theme that has occupied a prominent place in the minds of historians of economic thought and institutions and has a considerable literature. The author is a lecturer in economic history in the University of the Sacred Heart, Milan, whose previous writings have added to our knowledge of the earlier stages of capitalism in Italy. He displays no ecclesiastical or national bias and is well equipped to discuss the ethical antecedents and elements involved in the conflict between the medieval and the modern economic order. V. S. C.

Articles: John Bigelow, *The So-Called Bartholomew Columbus Map of 1506* (Geograph. Rev., Oct.); Louis Philippart, *Essai sur le mot et la notion d'Humanisme* (Rev. Synthèse, Dec.); K. Pleyer, *Die Reichweite der deutschen Reformation* (Hist. Zeitsch., Jan.); H. Wopfner, *Die Forschung nach den Ursachen des Bauernkrieges und ihre Förderung durch die Geschichtliche Volkskunde* (*ibid.*, Nov.); Friedrich Lammert, *Streit um die Kurwürde zwischen Sachsen-Lauenburg und Sachsen-Wittenberg* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Nov.); Joseph Rouault, *L'humanisme de Joachim du Bellay, angevin, et le regret de la Patrie* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Jan.); G. Constant, *Le changement doctrinal dans l'Église anglicane sous Edouard VI* [concl'd] (Rev. Hist. Ecclés., Jan.); André E. Sayous, *Le commerce de Melchior Man-*

lich et Cie d'Augsburg à Marseille et dans toute la Mediterranée entre 1571 et 1574 (Rev. Hist., Nov.); Lynn Thorndike, *Conrad Heingarter in Zurich Manuscripts, Especially his Medical Advice to the Duchess of Bourbon* (Bull. Inst. of Hist. of Med., Feb.); John W. Draper, *Political Themes in Shakespeare's Later Plays* (Jour. Eng. and Ger. Philol., Jan.); G. E. Fussell and V. G. B. Atwater, *Farmers' Goods and Chattels, 1500–1800* (History, Dec.).

Documents: Abbé Legros, ed., *Le "Thrésor de l'Eglise Parroichial Nostre-Dame d'Alenczon" à la fin de l'occupation anglaise* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Jan.).

SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

General review: Henry Bertram Hill, *The Constitutions of Continental Europe, 1789–1813* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Mar.).

Trois siècles d'histoire antillaise: Martinique et Guadeloupe de 1635 à nos jours, by Alfred Martineau, professor at the Collège de France, and L. P. May, archivist (Société de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises, pp. 282, 25 fr.), is a pioneer effort to stimulate research in the field of French Antillian history. Unlike the British West Indies, France's Caribbean colonies have suffered singular neglect at the hands of specialists in modern colonization. A partial explanation may be found in the lack of guides and similar tools which serve the double purpose of developing interest and facilitating investigation. In the present work political, social, and economic happenings in each of the several possessions are grouped under the five periods 1635–1674, 1674–1763, 1763–1802, 1802–1848, 1848–1935. A list of administrators, brief sketches of persons prominent in the islands' history, a selective bibliography and excellent reproductions of rare old maps will aid materially in making the volume serve its avowed purpose. L. J. R.

The study entitled *Histoire politique, économique, et sociale de la Martinique sous l'ancien régime, 1635–1789* (Marcel Rivière, pp. 337, 40 fr.), undertaken by Cabuzel Andréa Banbuck, a native Martiniquan, was published in conjunction with the tercentenary of the island's settlement. While broader in scope than L. P. May's *Histoire économique de la Martinique, 1635–1763* (Paris, 1930), it fails to attain the high standards of scholarship set by the latter. The large amount of duplication occasions regret that the author did not devote himself exclusively to either political or social developments which would have permitted a really significant contribution to the literature of European expansion. Undue dependence has been placed on readily accessible printed material. The frontispiece reproduces an excellent map prepared in the ministry of the marine in 1758. The appendixes include a useful list of administrators. As usual with such French works there is no index. L. J. R.

Historians will be interested in *Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford* (Clarendon Press) admirably edited by Professor David Nichol Smith. Some of the letters passed in the eventful summer of 1714; others throw light on the incidents attending the publication of Gulliver.

No. 3, vol. V of the Humanistic Studies published by the University of Kansas is a short monograph, *The London Journal and its Authors, 1720–1723*, by Professor Charles B. Realey, which contains some new information gathered by the author concerning writers for that influential journal in its important early years.

In his *Lord Chesterfield* (Macmillan, pp. xiv, 422, $5.00) Professor Samuel Shellabarger seeks to know the Chesterfield who wrote the letters to his son, "the individual, the wit, politician, and pedagogue of the eighteenth century". He is, however, not unaware of the ambitious peer who largely failed to achieve for himself the career for which he later tried in vain to train his son. But the political scene in which Chesterfield moved with so little ultimate satisfaction to himself was complicated, and it would be unreasonable to expect a student of a middle-aged letter writer always to thread his way unerringly through its maze. A more serious matter, he has not always been able to avoid the assumption that a misanthropic peer somehow typified the society in which he lived. If the letters have qualities that give them a timeless interest, perhaps it is in part due to the fact that the writer was not in all respects *en rapport* with his age. Whether or not the "goals" he proposed are "really worth striving for" would seem to be a question for a moralist rather than a biographer or historian. Nevertheless, Professor Shellabarger's book is a serious study, which readers interested in Chesterfield will find stimulating and suggestive. W. T. L.

In Vol. XXIX of the Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America is *A Chesterfield Bibliography to 1800* (pp. 114), by Sidney L. Gulick.

Articles: David Douglas, *William Dugdale: the "Grand Plagiary"* (History, Dec.); Erwin Hölzle, *Volks- und Rassenbewusstsein in der Englischen Revolution* (Hist. Zeitsch., Nov.); Birger Fahlborg, *Sveriges förbund med Frankrike, 1672* [the Swedish-French alliance in 1672] (Hist. Tidskr., 1935, no. 4); Theodore F. M. Newton, *William Pittis and Queen Anne Journalism* (Modern Philology, Nov.); Edwin S. Chalk, *Tiverton Letters and Papers, 1724–1843* (Notes and Queries, Jan. 11, 18, 25); Gustav Berthold Volz, *Die Reise des Prinzen Friedrich Wilhelm von Preussen nach Petersburg, 1780* (Zeitsch. f. Osteur. Gesch., 1935, no. 4); P. M. Bondois, *Le commissaire Nicolas Delamare et le Traité de la police* (Rev. Hist. Mod., Sept.); Michael Kraus, *Slavery Reform in the Eighteenth Century: an Aspect of Transatlantic Intellectual Cooperation* (Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog., Jan.); Philippe Sagnac, *Marie Antoinette et Barnave d'après leur correspondance secrète* (Rév. Fr., Rev. Hist. Cont., 1935, no. 3); H.

Cosson, *Lettres de Grégoire* [cont'd] (*ibid.*); R. Gauchet, *La rédaction du Tableau de dépréciation des Assignats* (*ibid.*); M. Eude, *Politique économique et sociale de la commune Robespierriste* (An. Hist. Rév. Fr., Nov.); G. Aubert, *La Révolution à Douai: La société des amis de la constitution* (*ibid.*); P. Sainte-Claire Deville, *La Commune de l'an II* [cont'd] (Rev. Ques. Hist., Nov.); D. Bonner Smith, *The Naval Mutinies of 1797* (Mariner's Mirror, Jan.).

Documents: Louis Gottschalk and Janet L. MacDonald, eds., *Letters on the Management of an Estate during the Old Régime* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Mar.); Owen Parry, ed., *The Financing of the Welsh Cattle Trade in the Eighteenth Century* (Bull. Board of Celtic Stud., Nov.); Serge Fleury, ed., *Les événements de Fructidor racontés par Monsieur de Talleyrand* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Jan.).

HISTORY SINCE 1800

General review: Commission d'histoire militaire de l'Académie hongroise des Sciences, *L'histoire militaire de la Guerre mondiale en Hongrie* (Rev. Hist. Guerre Mond., Oct.).

The 1936 edition of the *Political Handbook of the World* (Harper, for the Council on Foreign Relations, pp. 207, $2.50), edited by Walter H. Mallory, preserves the characteristics which have rendered its predecessors invaluable. It is interesting to note that Manchukuo now appears in the "Contents", although as a subhead under China. The statement on p. 37 is the same with the exception of the addition of the parenthetical clause apropos of the commitment to the Open Door, "but the establishment of a Petroleum Monopoly in 1935 is regarded by the American and British Governments as a violation of this commitment". There are also slight changes of statement in regard to the legal status of the Jews in Germany.

Archives of British Honduras, edited by the late Major Sir John Alder Burdon, governor and commander-in-chief, British Honduras, vol. III, from 1841 to 1884 (Sifton Praed, pp. x, 401, 7*s.* 6*d.*), embraces the period from the creation of an executive council to the severance of all ties with Jamaica and the attainment of full-fledged colony status. Its publication completes the late Governor Burdon's ambitious project of placing a comprehensive calendar of local archival material before students and, thanks to his efforts, the writing of a scholarly history of the colony now first becomes possible. Incoming and outgoing dispatches, legislative papers, court records, Indian correspondence, laws, and official gazettes are briefed in admirable fashion and entries contain a wealth of information on political, social, and economic questions. Population, trade, and financial statistics have been grouped as appendixes. Like the previous volumes (*Am. Hist. Rev.,* XXXVIII, 164 and XLI, 390), the editing leaves nothing to be desired. A detailed chro-

nology, a selective bibliography, a reproduction of Alfred Usher's famous map of 1891, and a detailed index merit special mention. L. J. R.

Publication has been begun by Payot of a new *Histoire de la Guerre mondiale* in four volumes. Vol. IV, *Foch et la victoire des Alliés* (25 fr.), by General René Tournè, is the first to appear. The other volumes are *Joffre et la Guerre de Mouvement, 1914,* by General Duffour, *Joffre et la Guerre d'Usure, 1915–1916,* by General Daille, and *Le commandement des Généraux Nivelle et Pétain,* by General Hellot.

In view of what Professor Edgar Robinson said at the Annual Dinner of the Association about the significance of the "Interpreter" in recent journalism (see page 441) the volume entitled *Interpretations, 1933–1935* (Macmillan, 1936, pp. x, 399, $2.50), by Walter Lippmann, selected and edited by Allan Nevins, has special interest.

Varied in its selection of quotations and independent in its interpretation, *World Diary, 1929–1934,* by Mr. Quincy Howe, editor of *The Living Age,* presents a chronological account of world affairs during these episodic five years (McBride, 1934, pp. x, 393). Mr. Howe has written in the conviction that "applied science has created a world-wide revolution in agriculture, industry, and society", and that "this revolution has made Germany, Japan, and the colonial nations the most important countries to watch just now". The work is illustrated with maps and foreign cartoons: but a map of South America places Valparaiso in Peru and Lima in Chile. This is not just another diary or chronicle of bare facts, but a sustained narrative which gives a better understanding of recent significant events of world history. L. F. S.

The historical background, so necessary to the examination of any serious international problem, is described for the Abyssinian question in *Ethiopia, a Pawn in European Diplomacy* (Macmillan, pp. xi, 354, $2.50), by Professor Ernest Work, who was formerly adviser to the Ethiopian government, and *A History of Abyssinia* (Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 188, $2.25), by A. H. M. Jones and Elizabeth Monroe. The latter work is mainly historical, going back to the legendary origin of the country, and tracing its vicissitudes through the Middle Ages to the present time. Part VI deals with the "Dispute with Italy".

Articles: E. Anrich, *War Stein Romantiker?* (Hist. Zeitsch., Jan.); Alexandre Onou, *Correspondance inédite de baron Alexandre de Jomini, 1817–1883* (Rev. Hist. Mod., Sept.); J. Holland Rose, *The Royal Navy and the Suppression of the West African Slave Trade, 1815–1865* [I] (Mariner's Mirror, Jan.); F. E. Manuel, *L'introduction des machines en France et les ouvriers: La grève des tisserands de Lodève* [II] (Rev. Hist.

Mod., Sept.); Heinrich Ritter von Srbik, *Die Schönbrunner Konferenzen vom August 1864* (Hist. Zeitsch., Nov.); Arnold Oskar Meyer, *Die Aktenveröffentlichung über die auswärtige Politik Preussens, 1858–1871* (*ibid.*, Jan.); Lawrence D. Steefel, *The Rothschilds and the Austrian Loan of 1865* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Mar.); G. A. Ballard, *British Frigates of 1875: the "Inconstant" and "Raleigh"* (Mariner's Mirror, Jan.); Ada von Erdmann, *Nikolaj Karlovič Giers, russischer Aussenminister, 1882–1895: Eine politische Biographie* (Zeitsch. f. Osteur. Gesch., 1935, no. 4); Raymond Beazley, *Joseph Chamberlain und die englisch-deutschen Beziehungen im Jahre 1898* (Berl. Monatsh., Dec.); E. C. Helmreich, *Ein Nachtrag zu den serbisch-bulgarischen Abkommen von 1912* (*ibid.*); Comte de Saint Aulaire, *Jules Cambon* (Rev. Hist. Dipl., Oct.); Henri de Manneville, *Les derniers jours de l'ambassade de M. Jules Cambon* (*ibid.*); Jules Isaac, *Crise européenne et la Grande Guerre à l'occasion d'un livre récent, 1904–1914* [Renouvin] (Rev. Hist., Nov.); Eduard Czegka, *Die Mobilmachung der europäischen Mächte im Sommer 1914* [I]: *Serbien und Montenegro* (Berl. Monatsh., Jan.); Gustav Gratz, *Graf Stefan Tisza* (*ibid.*, Feb.); Carl F. Brand, *British Labor and the International during the Great War* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Mar.); H. A. De Weerd, *The Kitchener Legend* (Infantry Jour., Jan.); Albert Pingaud, *Les origines de l'expédition de Salonique* (Rev. Hist., Nov.); Lindsay Rogers and W. R. Dittmar, *The Reichswirtschaftsrat: De Mortuis* (Pol. Sci. Quar., Dec.); William F. Hummel, *K'ang Yu-wei, Historical Critic and Social Philosopher, 1858–1927* (Pacific Hist. Rev., Dec.).

UNITED STATES

GENERAL

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: typewritten copies of historical notes relating to parishes in Prince George's County, Maryland, by the Rev. Dr. Ethan Allen; 41 papers of William Hemsley, relating to the tobacco business in Maryland, etc., 1784 to 1786; a volume of papers relating to a court martial, 1816, and to duels between naval officers, 1813 to 1843; photostats of 27 papers of Albert Sidney Johnston, 1822 to 1861, and of 15 papers of William Preston Johnston, 1852 to 1863; a large collection of papers of Thomas S. Jesup; photostats of memoirs by William M. Gwin of his period of service in the Senate, 1850 to 1861; letter book and other papers of James Chesnut, jr., chief of the military department, South Carolina, 1862; a typewritten biographical sketch of Major General David M. Gregg by David M. Gregg, 1934; about 279 letters of Daniel R. Larned, private secretary to General Burnside during the Civil War; papers of Caleb Cushing, 13 large boxes; photostats and typewritten copies of letters from, to, and relating to Matthew Quay, 1871 to 1927; 156 scrapbooks, accompanied

by nine volumes of indexes, and seven volumes of diaries, of Charles S. Hamlin, 1886 to 1925; three letter books of Don. M. Dickinson, 1887–1889, and 73 letters received by him; papers of Joseph Pulitzer, two chests; papers of Brand Whitlock, six large boxes; additional papers of Benjamin Harrison and William Dudley Foulke.

The flow of Federal archives into the new National Archives building began on December 27 with the transfer of the records and papers of the War Labor Board, which had been in the custody of the Department of Labor. This is a comparatively small collection (about 200 cubic feet), but in the two weeks beginning on January 6 the records of the Food Administration of World War times, amounting to some 17,000 cubic feet, were transferred from the White House garage, where they had been in storage. In connection with the wind-up of the National Recovery Administration, a decision was reached to have the files of the 58 field offices located throughout the country shipped directly to the National Archives, and nearly all of them were received during February (about 4000 cubic feet). Arrangements have also been made for the transfer from the Department of Justice of the papers of the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement (the Wickersham Commission). They amount to about 130 cubic feet. The work of cleaning, fumigating, classifying, and filing the papers received is being pushed as rapidly as is feasible, but it will necessarily be some time before they will be readily available to research workers.

The National Archives Council, composed of the members of the Cabinet (or their representatives), the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on the Library, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Archivist, which is directed by law to define the classes of material to be transferred to the National Archives, was organized on December 27, and Secretary Hull was elected chairman. At a second meeting on February 10 the Council adopted a resolution authorizing the Archivist to requisition for transfer to the National Archives any material falling within the following classes:

I. Any archives or records (a) which the head of the agency in custody of them may deem not to be necessary for use in the conduct of the regular current business of said agency; (b) which he may consider to be in such physical condition that they cannot be used without danger of damage to them; and (c) for which, in his opinion, he is unable to provide adequate or safe storage.

II. Any archives or records of any Federal agency that has gone out of existence unless its functions have been transferred to the agency which has custody of its records.

III. Any other archives or records which the National Archives Council by special resolution, or which the head of the agency in custody of them for special reasons, may authorize to be transferred to the National Archives.

In view of the approaching sesquicentennial of the framing and ratification of the Constitution of the United States, and after a careful survey of existing editions of documents bearing on every phase of the subject, the National Historical Publications Commission has concluded that the processes of ratification most need the light which would come from a comprehensive collection of material. The Commission has proposed to the Congress that such a work be undertaken. The plan would include particularly proceedings in the several state legislatures and conventions, and the discussion of the subject in contemporary newspapers, pamphlets, and even private correspondence. Where, as in the case of the *Federalist,* many good editions exist, reference to these would suffice. *Elliott's Debates,* however, has never been adequately edited. On the basis of the preliminary survey the Commission estimates that six volumes with a total of four thousand pages would be needed for the material pertinent to ratification, including the question of the first ten amendments because they were proposed in principle by several of the conventions as a condition of ratification. If immediate provision is made for this work a part of the volumes should be ready by 1938, the sesquicentennial of the completion of ratification by the necessary number of states.

A survey of the archives of the Federal government outside of Washington has been inaugurated under the auspices of the Works Progress Administration with the National Archives as co-operating sponsor. Dr. Philip M. Hamer and Dr. Theodore R. Schellenberg of the National Archives staff have been designated as National Director and Associate Director of the survey, respectively. A corps of regional supervisors and project superintendents has been organized to supervise the work of the local field workers. It is expected that the survey will promote more adequate care of the records and will enable the Archivist of the United States to formulate plans for requisitioning such of them as should be transferred to the National Archives building.

Among the recent accessions of the Naval Historical Foundation the following may be noted: three letters of Admiral D. D. Porter, 1867–1881; fourteen original letters of Commodore David Porter, 1811–1830; several letters relating to negotiations with Aguinaldo, 1898; letter reporting capture of U. S. S. *Indianola* by Confederate vessel *Queen of the West;* Records of the Manila Bay Society; Journals of U. S. S. *Vincennes,* 1833–1836, and *Ohio* and *Congress,* 1838–1843, Lieut. R. L. Browning Collection; more than one hundred Spanish-American War photographs, gift of Major Roger Taylor. C. O. P.

Dr. Elbert Vaughan Wills is the author of a small volume entitled *The Growth of American Higher Education, Liberal, Professional, and Tech-*

nical (Dorrance, pp. 225, $2.00). It is comprehensive, opening with a study of the colonial college, and its final chapter deals with "The Junior College".

In *The Constitution in School and College* (Putnam, pp. xiii, 315, $3.50) Dr. H. Arnold Bennett argues that for introductory courses in government in colleges and high schools the Constitution itself be made the basis of study. The conception of the Constitution should, however, be dynamic, rather than static. A realistic or historical view of the origin of its provisions is assumed, in order to guard against a fetishism which would inhibit effort to change or amend. The author's thesis gains new force from the revival through the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of respect for legal modes of procedure. Perhaps if his book had been written after the decisions were handed down he would not have been so sure that "the federal idea obviously is still losing ground" as against a system of unitary government. The author gains his approach by a review of what has actually been done in the schools, described in such chapters as "Textbooks and the Constitution", the "Attempt to legislate the Constitution into the Curriculum", and "Actual Instruction in the Constitution". The work is abundantly equipped with bibliographical references.

Dr. Charles A. Beard's *Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* (Macmillan, pp. xxi, 330, $2.00) has been reissued with a new introduction which seeks to clarify the aims of the work as well as to reply to some of its critics. The new edition appears at an opportune moment.

Colonel G. F. R. Henderson's famous work on *Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War* (Longmans, Green, 1936, pp. xxiv, 737, $5.00) has now been reprinted in an American edition. It first appeared in August, 1898, in two volumes, and has been reprinted many times since. The appearance of an American edition is appropriate at this time in view of the publication of Freeman's *R. E. Lee*.

Those persons who are interested in the navy will find much instruction and entertainment in Dr. Jim Dan Hill's *Sea Dogs of the Sixties: Farragut and Seven Contemporaries* (University of Minnesota Press, pp. xiv, 265, $3.00), which may well serve college students as an introduction to the naval history of the Civil War. The narrative, somewhat popular in form, is based upon a considerable reading of the sources of information. That Clio is no longer a grave, dignified personage is suggested by the author's use of colloquialisms and cliché's, such as "dogs of war", "sea dogs", "sassy", "piping times of peace", and "knocked into a cocked hat" which sounds naval, but is not. Truxtun is misspelled. Of the eight officers whose careers are described, four, Farragut, Wilkes, Rodgers, and Winslow, are Unionists; and four, Wilkinson, Bulloch, Read, and Waddell, are Confederates. Choice

was made of these, and several more eminent officers were rejected, by reason of the author's criteria, picturesqueness of career, fitness for illustrating different phases of naval history, and novelty of biography. There is considerable unity in the subject matter, but this would seem to be exaggerated in the statement that the "combined stories in time become a single fabric of eight interlocked patterns". The book is well illustrated by reproductions of portraits and ships and by new sketch maps. It is a creditable production.

C. O. P.

Herman Hagedorn's *The Magnate: William Boyce Thompson and his Time* (Reynal and Hitchcock, pp. viii, 343, $3.00), has three important chapters on the Red Cross Mission of 1917 to Russia. The author has had access to the Thompson papers and has collected essential information from those associated with Thompson in this Mission. Other chapters in the book illustrate one of the most spectacular careers in American mining and finance.

Under the auspices of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America an interesting study of public opinion in the young republic apropos of the destruction of another "republic" across the seas has been published under the title of *The Fall of Poland in Contemporary American Opinion* (pp. xv, 271). The author is Miecislaus Haiman.

Douglas C. McMurtrie has edited three small volumes of interest in the history of printing. The first is made up of four letters to Franklin, written by Peter Timothy of Charleston, which throw light on the problems of the colonial printer. Its title is *Letters of Peter Timothy, Printer of Charleston, South Carolina, to Benjamin Franklin* (Black Cat Press). The second and third volumes are *The General Epistle of the Latter Day Saints, December 23, 1847*, which is a facsimile of the earliest known example of printing in Nebraska, and *The Beginnings of the American Newspaper* (both from the same press), a facsimile of the broadside issued by Samuel Green, jr., entitled *The Present State of the New-English Affairs*.

Cuba and the United States, 1900–1935 (George Banta, pp. xi, 311, $3.00), by Russell H. Fitzgibbon, is an informative account of the development of Cuba as it has been conditioned by or coincident with the interest of the United States. It is based upon a careful study of extensive sources in both countries. Its numerous enlightening comments and frank evaluations of persons and undertakings are, however, somewhat obscured by pages of detailed chronology in which there is scant emphasis on the more significant points. The author asserts that the island's troubles are largely internal—political immaturity and economic unbalance being paramount. The abrogation of the Platt Amendment is hailed as a wise diplomatic step, but not as a panacea. Mr. Fitzgibbon definitely concludes that the advantages of United States interference, reform, and tutelage have far out-

weighed the ills of sugar exploitations and financial maneuverings, which are in fact minimized. P. C. B.

A second edition has been issued of the *Collection Mallet: Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de l'Union Saint-Jean-Baptiste d'Amérique* (Woonsocket, R. I., pp. 303). This library is believed to be the most important collection in the United States bearing on the history of the French in America. The previous edition appeared in 1917.

Vol. XIX of Smith College Studies in History presents two essays in the field of economic history, *Shutdowns in the Connecticut Valley: a Study of Worker Displacement in the Small Industrial Community*, by Katharine Du Pre Lumpkin and Mable V. Combs, and *Studies in the Economic History of the Ohio Valley, Seasonal Aspects of Industry and Commerce before the Age of Big Business, the Beginnings of Industrial Combination*, by Louis C. Hunter.

Articles: E. H. O'Neill, *Modern American Biography* (N. Am. Rev., Dec.); Frederic L. Paxson, *The New Frontier and the Old American Habit* (Pacific Hist. Rev., Dec.); Chester E. Jorgenson, *The New Science in the Almanacs of Ames and Franklin* (New England Quar., Dec.); J. J. Spengler, *Malthusianism in Eighteenth Century America* (Am. Ec. Rev., Dec.); Lowell Joseph Ragatz, *Les Antilles dans l'histoire coloniale anglaise de l'Amérique du Nord* (Rev. Hist. Col., 1935, no. 2); Henry Tatter, *State and Federal Land Policy during the Confederation Period* (Agricultural Hist., Oct.); J. H. Powell, *John Dickinson and the Constitution* (Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog., Jan.); John A. Zvetina, *The Judiciary Act of 1789—a Stepping Stone in National Development* (Mid-America, Jan.); Arthur P. Whitaker, *Louisiana in the Treaty of Basel* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Mar.); Charles A. Beard, *Jefferson in America Now* (Yale Rev., winter); Dixon Ryan Fox, *The Development of the American Theater* (New York Hist., Jan.); Erna Risch, *Immigrant Aid Societies before 1820* (Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog., Jan.); *Some Records of the "Forty-Niners":* [I] Edwin S. Welles, compiler, *Passengers on the Barque "Selman" from New York, 11 April, 1849*, [II] Frank E. Sanborn, *From Boston around Cape Horn to Valparaiso, 1849–1850*, [III] Henry B. Philips, *The Company on the "Crescent", from Salem, Massachusetts, and an Incident of their Voyage, 1849–1850* (New England Hist. and Geneal. Reg., Jan.); Thomas D. Clark, *The Slavery Background of Foster's My Old Kentucky Home* (Filson Club Hist. Quar., Jan.); Harold C. Durrell, compiler, *The Centralization of Vital Records in the Various States* (New England Hist. and Geneal. Reg., Jan.); Nicholas Murray Butler, *Across the Busy Years: Fourteen Republican Conventions* [1900–1912] (Scribner's Mag., Jan., Feb.).

Documents: Bernhard A. Uhlendorf and Edna Vosper, eds., *Letters of*

Major Baurmeister during the Philadelphia Campaign, 1777–1778 [II] (Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog., Jan.); Louis H. Bolander, ed., *The Log of the "Ranger"* [1778–1779] (United States Naval Inst. Proc., Feb.).

NEW ENGLAND, MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

Vol. XXVIII of the *Transactions, 1930–1933* of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts (Boston, pp. xvii, 586) contains papers and documents of quite unusual interest. Three of the large number (31) offer details of libraries in colonial Massachusetts. The first is a combined list, prepared by Charles F. and Robin Robinson, of three libraries which belonged to colonial clergymen, Thomas Jenner, Thomas Weld, and Thomas Weld's grandson and namesake. The first two came to Massachusetts in 1635 and 1632. Their libraries were purchased in 1651 for John Eliot by the Corporation for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England. This part of the combined list numbers 1 to 472 and was found in the Rawlinson Manuscript C 934 in the Bodleian Library. The third library list, nos. 473 to 565, comes from an inventory in the Middlesex County archives. Another contribution with similar interest presents a discussion, with an alphabetical list, by Arthur Orlo Norton of "Harvard Text-Books and Reference Books of the Seventeenth Century". Professor Samuel Eliot Morison has contributed a "Note on the Library of George Alcock, Medical Student, 1676". There is also an important article by Professor Curtis Nettels on "England's Trade with New England and New York, 1685-1720". A contribution of another type is the address of Charles McLean Andrews at the annual dinner of the society in 1932, when he discoursed with charming humor upon "Historic Doubts regarding Early Massachusetts History". Many readers of the volume will also turn with satisfaction to the "Memoir of Frederick Jackson Turner", by Mark Antony DeWolfe Howé. A portrait of Professor Turner is the frontispiece.

The January *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* initiates the plan of describing the more important collections of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania with an account of the David J. Kennedy Collection of 650 aquarelles and pencil drawings depicting every feature of Philadelphia life from 1836 to 1898, structures of every type from churches to jails, and clubs to circuses, taverns, docks, and ships. The importance of such a collection to the historian of the city needs no emphasis. Among recent additions to the society's manuscripts is one which illustrates the danger of the loss of valuable records through the shortsightedness of municipal bodies. It seems that the city council had authorized the destruction of Philadelphia's financial records from 1800 to 1854. The mayor rescued them and turned them over to the society. Another valuable accession belongs to the archives of business history, the ledgers, journals, and invoices of the

firm of V. and J. F. Gilpin, covering the interesting period from 1822 to 1865.

Articles: Clifford K. Shipton, *The Shaping of Revolutionary New England, 1680–1740* (Pol. Sci. Quar., Dec.); Lawrence Martin, *Women fought at Bunker Hill* (New England Quar., Dec.); Ivor Debenham Spencer, *Christmas, the Upstart* (*ibid.*); Alexander J. Wall, jr., *The Great Fire of 1835* (New York Hist. Soc. Quar. Bull., Jan.); Fred J. Johnston, *Ulster County Cabinet and Glass Makers* (New York Hist., Jan.); Louise H. Zimm, *The Artful Advertisers of Old Ulster* (*ibid.*); Joseph J. McCadden, *Robert Vaux and his Associates in the Pennsylvania Society for the Promotion of Public Schools* (Pennsylvania Hist., Jan.); J. Cutler Andrews, *The Antimasonic Movement in Western Pennsylvania* (Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag., Dec.); Marian Silveus, *McNair Correspondence: Land Problems in Northwestern Pennsylvania* (*ibid.*).

Documents: Raymond P. Stearns, ed., *Letters and Documents by or relating to Hugh Peter* (Essex Inst. Hist. Coll., Oct.).

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The Thirty-fifth Annual Meeting of the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina was held in Raleigh on December 5, 6. The Presidential Address was delivered by Professor Phillips Russell. Among the papers presented were "Problems of North Carolina Cotton Manufacturers before 1860", by Mrs. Lucius A. Bigelow, and "Explorations, Maps, and Names of Early North Carolina", by Professor W. P. Cumming.

Articles: Clarence Poe, *Wherein I set a Good Example: Recording Family Traditions* (South Atlantic Quar., Jan.); Margaret Davis, *Tidewater Churches* (*ibid.*); Trevor Arnett, *Progress of Education in the South* (*ibid.*); Edgar Legare Pennington, *The Reverend Francis Le Jau's Work among Indians and Negro Slaves* (Jour. Southern Hist., Nov.); P. L. Rainwater, *Economic Benefits of Secession: Opinions in Mississippi in the 1850s* (*ibid.*); Francis B. Simkins and James W. Patton, *The Work of Southern Women among the Sick and Wounded of the Confederate Armies* (*ibid.*); C. B. Camerer, *The Last Days of "Stonewall" Jackson* (Military Surgeon, Feb.); Lawrence F. Hill, *The Confederate Exodus to Latin-America* [II] (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Jan.); *Edmund Randolph's Essay on the Revolutionary History of Virginia, 1774–1782* [cont'd] (Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog., Jan.); *Letters from Tyler Trunks, "Sherwood Forest", Virginia: Political Letters, 1832–1834* (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Jan.); Douglas C. McMurtrie, *A Bibliography of North Carolina Imprints, 1761–1800* [I] (North Carolina Hist. Rev., Jan.); Julia C. Spruill, *Southern Housewives before the Revolution* (*ibid.*); William A. Mabry, *"White Supremacy" and the North Carolina Suffrage Amendment* (*ibid.*); Walter

A. Harris, *Old Ocmulgee Fields: the Capital Town of the Creek Confederacy* (Georgia Hist. Quar., Dec.); Paul Murray, *Agriculture in the Interior of Georgia, 1830–1860* (*ibid.*); *Letters of William Panton to John Forbes* [May 6, June 4, 1794] (Florida Hist. Quar., Jan.); Mark F. Boyd, *The First American Road in Florida: Pensacola-St. Augustine Highway, 1824* [II] (*ibid.*); A. B. Moore, *Railroad Building in Alabama during the Reconstruction Period* (Jour. Southern Hist., Nov.); Douglas C. McMurtrie, *The French Press of Louisiana: Notes in Supplement to Edward Larocque Tinker's "Bibliography of French Newspapers and Periodicals of Louisiana"* (Louisiana Hist. Quar., Oct.); William B. Glover, *A History of the Caddo Indians* (*ibid.*); J. Fair Hardin, *An Outline of Shreveport and Caddo Parish History* (*ibid.*); Al B. Nelson, *Campaigning in the Big Bend of the Rio Grande in 1787* (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Jan.).

Documents: R. A. Lancaster, jr., ed., *Diary of Col. William Bolling* [cont'd] (Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog., Jan.); Mattie Austin Hatcher, ed., *Letters of Antonio Martinez* [III] (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Jan.).

WESTERN TERRITORIES AND STATES

Vol. V of the *Augustana Historical Society Publications* (Rock Island, pp. 160) includes, among other contributions: "Diary kept by L. P. Esbjörn, 1849", translated, with an introduction, by O. L. Nordstrom; the "Sources of the Original Constitution of the Augustana Synod", introduction by Conrad Bergendoff; and "Early Letters to Erland Carlsson", translated, with an introduction, by E. W. Olson. There is also "A Selected List from the Charles XV Collection", the gift in 1861 of Bernadotte's royal grandson to the Augustana College Library. The monogram of Oscar I, Bernadotte's son, appears on many of the volumes. The list has been prepared by Professor George Gordon Andrews.

An important phase of American political life is illustrated in Harold F. Gosnell's *Negro Politicians: the Rise of Negro Politics in Chicago* (University of Chicago Press, pp. xxxi, 404, $3.50). Professor Robert E. Park has furnished an introduction.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has received further accessions to the J. R. Doolittle Papers, mainly correspondence during and after the Civil War. There are also diaries. Another interesting diary covers the service of C. H. Dickinson with the 22d Wisconsin Infantry from August 14, 1862, to June 28, 1865. An important publication of the society is the *British Régime in Wisconsin and the Northwest*, by Louise Phelps Kellogg, senior research associate.

Copying Manuscripts: Rules worked out by the Minnesota Historical Society, by Grace Lee Nute, is issued as Special Bulletin, II, of the Minnesota Historical Society.

Articles: John J. Stoudt, *Daniel and Squire Boone: a Study in Historical Symbolism* (Pennsylvania Hist., Jan.); Douglas C. McMurtrie, *A Bibliography of Eighteenth Century Kentucky Broadsides* (Filson Club Hist. Quar., Jan.); Edgar E. Hume, *Lafayette in Kentucky* [cont'd] (Reg. Kentucky State Hist. Soc., Jan.); W. Eugene Shiels, *The Jesuits in Ohio in the Eighteenth Century* (Mid-America, Jan.); Ashley Brown, *The Expedition of Colonel John B. Campbell of the 19th U. S. Infantry in November, 1812, from Franklintown to the Mississinewa Indian Villages* (Hist. Soc. Northwestern Ohio Quar. Bull., Jan.); Dorothy B. Dorsey, *The Panic and Depression of 1837–1843 in Missouri* (Missouri Hist. Rev., Jan.); Roy T. King, *Robert William Wells, Jurist, Public Servant, and Designer of the Missouri State Seal* (*ibid.*); Jacob A. Swisher, *The Legislation of the Forty-Sixth General Assembly of Iowa* (Iowa Jour. Hist. and Pol., Jan.); Harold M. Dorr, *The Executive Veto in Michigan* (Michigan Hist. Mag., winter); Wade Millis, *Fort Wayne, Detroit* (*ibid.*); George N. Fuller, *Detroit, Michigan's Capital 100 Years ago* (*ibid.*); Filip A. Forsbeck, *New Upsala: the First Swedish Settlement in Wisconsin* (Wisconsin Mag. Hist., Dec.); Grace Lee Nute, *Radisson and Groseilliers' Contribution to Geography* (Minnesota Hist., Dec.); Fulmer Mood, *The London Background of the Radisson Problem* (*ibid.*); James C. Malin, *The Turnover in Farm Population in Kansas* (Kansas Hist. Quar., Nov.); Rebecca Wells-Taylor, *Some Lost Towns of Western Kansas* (Aerend, fall); C. O. Snow, *History of the Half-Breed Tract* (Nebraska Hist. Mag., Jan.); Grant Foreman, *Oklahoma's First Court* (Chron. Oklahoma, Dec.); John B. Meserve, *Chief John Ross* (*ibid.*); Levette Jay Davidson, *O. J. Goldrick, Pioneer Journalist* (Colorado Mag., Jan.); France V. Scholes, *Church and State in New Mexico, 1610–1650* (New Mexico Hist. Rev., Jan.); Robert L. Housman, *The First Territorial Legislature in Montana* (Pacific Hist. Rev., Dec.); Roy M. Robbins, *The Federal Land System in an Embryo State* (*ibid.*); Clarence Hines, *Adams, Russia, and Northwest Trade, 1824* (Oregon Hist. Quar.); Iva L. Buchanan, *Lumbering and Logging in the Puget Sound Region in Territorial Days* (Pacific Northwest Quar. [formerly the Washington Historical Quarterly], Jan.); Dorothy O. Johansen, *The Simeon G. Reed Collection of Letters and Private Papers* (*ibid.*); Arthur S. Beardsley, *Code Making in Early Oregon* (*ibid.*).

Documents: Gilbert J. Garraghan, *Some Hitherto Unpublished Marquettiana* (Mid-America, Jan.); Leland W. Meyer, ed., *The Great Crossings Church Records, 1795–1801* (Reg. Kentucky State Hist. Soc., Jan.); Samuel M. Wilson, ed., *The Court Proceedings of 1806 in Kentucky against Aaron Burr and John Adair* (Filson Club Hist. Quar., Jan.); Lowell J. Ragatz, ed., *Memoirs of a Sauk Swiss* [*Rev. Oswald Ragatz*] (Wisconsin Mag. Hist., Dec.); Jane Lewis Chapin, ed., *Letters of John McLoughlin* (Oregon Hist. Quar., Dec.); Floy Laird, ed., *Reminiscences of Francis M. Redfield:*

Chief Joseph's War (Pacific Northwest Quar., Jan.); S. K. Padover, ed. and tr., *Placer-mining in California* (Pacific Hist. Rev., Dec.).

CANADA

The Public Archives of Canada have continued their publication of *Documents relating to the Constitutional History of Canada* with a fourth volume (Ottawa, pp. xi, 538) covering the years 1819-1828. The editors are Arthur G. Doughty and Norah Story.

The Ontario Historical Society has issued vol. XXX of its *Papers and Records* (Toronto, 1934, pp. 311). Among the many articles dealing with all phases of Canadian history may be noted: "The Loyalists of New Brunswick", by Professor Chester Martin; "The Background of the Loyalist Movement, 1763-1783", by Professor George M. Wrong; and "An Introduction to the Economic History of Ontario: from Outpost to Empire", by Professor H. A. Innis.

The University of Oklahoma Press has added to its valuable series on the Civilization of the American Indian a work on *Naskapi: the Savage Hunters of the Labrador Peninsula* (pp. 248, $3.50), by Frank G. Speck.

Articles: Fred Landon, *The Agricultural Journals of Upper Canada* [Ontario] (Agricultural Hist., Oct.); Philip Child, *The Noble Army of Martyrs in Huronia* (University of Toronto Quar., Oct.); R. M. Saunders, *The First Introduction of European Plants and Animals into Canada* (Canadian Hist. Rev., Dec.); Freda F. Waldon, *Queen Anne and "The Four Kings of Canada": a Bibliography of Contemporary Sources* (*ibid.*, Sept.); Frank H. Underhill, *The Development of National Political Parties in Canada* (*ibid.*, Dec.); Grace Fox, *The Reception of Lord Durham's* "Report" *in the English Press* (*ibid.*, Sept.); George W. Brown, *The Grit Party and the Great Reform Convention of 1859* (*ibid.*).

Documents: James A. Gibson, ed., *Sir Edmund Head's Memorandum on the Choice of Ottawa as the Seat of Government* (Canadian Hist. Rev., Dec.); E. Wilson Lyon, ed., *Proposals to transfer the French Population of Canada to Louisiana* (*ibid.*, Sept.); William D. Overman, ed., *Some Letters of Joshua R. Giddings on Reciprocity* (*ibid.*).

Contributions have been made to the section of Historical News by G. C. Boyce, P. C. Brooks, T. R. S. Broughton, E. C. Burnett, V. S. Clark, R. D. W. Connor, Margaret S. Ermarth, J. F. Jameson, L. M. Larson, W. T. Laprade, W. G. Leland, R. A. Newhall, Roy F. Nichols, C. O. Paullin, L. J. Ragatz, J. T. Shotwell, L. F. Stock, Lynn Thorndike.

PAGE

Bezanson, *et al., Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, by Curtis Nettels 549
Paltsits, *Washington's Farewell Address*, by Samuel Flagg Bemis 550
Monaghan, *John Jay*, by J. C. Fitzpatrick 551
Hesseltine, *Ulysses S. Grant, Politician*, by Elbert J. Benton 553
Muzzey, *James G. Blaine*, by A. T. Volwiler 554
Nevins, *Abram S. Hewitt and Peter Cooper*, by Victor S. Clark 557
Bailey, *Roosevelt and the Japanese-American Crises*, by Howard K. Beale 559
War Memoirs of Lansing, by Charles Seymour 561

SHORTER NOTICES

Coulter and Gartenfeld, *Historical Bibliographies*, by Gray C. Boyce 563
Thoron, *Codex quartus Sancti Iacobi, editus a Beato Turpino* 564
Munro, *Kingdom of the Crusaders*, by Richard A. Newhall 565
Demangeon, *Le Rhin*, by Preston Slosson 565
Pocquet du Haut-Jussé, *Bourgogne et Bretagne*, by Richard A. Newhall 566
Dunham, *The Fane Fragment*, by Frances H. Relf 567
Sée, *Le XVI^e siècle*, by Hastings Eells 567
Franz, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg: Aktenband*, by Wallace K. Ferguson 568
Argenti, *Expedition of the Florentines to Chios*, by Palmer A. Throop 569
Bryant, *The England of Charles II*, by W. C. Abbott 570
Hinds, *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, XXXV, by Frederick George Marcham 571
Cell, *Rediscovery of Wesley*, by John T. McNeill 572
Gerretson and Geyl, *Briefwisseling van Bentinck*, by Robert H. George 573
Beaglehole, *Exploration of the Pacific*, by Arthur P. Scott 574
Dommanget, *Pages choisies de Babeuf*, by George Gordon Andrews 574
Elicona, *Mercau de Saint-Méry*, by John Hall Stewart 575
Booth, *Zachary Macaulay*, by Edward P. Cheyney 576
Benson, *Queen Victoria*, by Herbert C. F. Bell 577
Vidler, *The Modernist Movement*, by W. E. Garrison 578
Squires, *British Propaganda, 1914–1917*, by Howard M. Ehrmann 579
Beyens, *Quatre ans à Rome*, by Leo F. Stock 579
Gathorne-Hardy, *International Affairs, 1920–1934*, by F. Lee Benns 580
Hanke, *First Social Experiments in America*, by H. I. Priestley 581
Lanning, *Spanish Missions of Georgia*, by Lillian Estelle Fisher 582
Pease, *The French Foundations, 1680–1693*, by M. M. Quaife 583
Hoffmann, *Diary of the Alarcón Expedition*, by John Tate Lanning 584
Brodin, *Les Quakers en Amérique*, by William I. Hull 584
Sanders, *Evolution of Executive Departments*, by Edmund C. Burnett 585
Easterby, *College of Charleston*, by Thomas Perkins Abernethy 586
Westermann, *The Netherlands and the United States*, by Samuel Flagg Bemis 587
Manning, *Diplomatic Correspondence: Inter-American Affairs*, V, by J. Fred Rippy 588
Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South*, by Dwight L. Dumond 588
Quiett, *They built the West*, by L. P. 589
Stephenson, *John Lind*, by Marcus L. Hansen 590
Rydjord, *Foreigners and Independence of New Spain*, by John C. Patterson 591

This journal is unable to review textbooks or works of current discussion.

Entered as second-class matter January 16, 1932, at the post office at Richmond, Va., under the act of March 3, 1879.

THE WILLIAM BYRD PRESS, INC., PRINTERS
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

THE CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY

This authoritative series will be completed in April with the publication of the eighth and final volume. The set is renowned for its comprehensive treatment of the periods covered and for the painstaking scholarship of the distinguished historians who have made it an invaluable work of reference.

I.	The Christian Roman Empire and the Foundation of the Teutonic Kingdoms	$5.50
II.	The Rise of the Saracens and the Foundation of the Western Empire	$5.50
III.	Germany and the Western Empire	$13.00
IV.	The Eastern Roman Empire (717-1453)	$13.00
V.	Contest of Empire and Papacy	$13.00
VI.	Victory of the Papacy	$13.00
VII.	Decline of Empire and Papacy	$12.00
VIII.	The Growth of Nationalities	$12.00

The Set, $90.00

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
60 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, N. Y.